DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 063 253 SP 005 689

TITLE	Evaluation of a Series of Five 1971 Teacher Education Workshops Sponsored by the New England Program in Teacher Education.
INSTITUTION	New Hampshire Univ., Durham. Div. of Continuing Education.
PUB DATE	7 Feb 72
NOTE	97p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Responsibility; *Educational Change; *Role Perception; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Workshops

ABSTRACT

The New England Program in Teacher Education (NEPTE) sponsored and evaluated five teacher education workshops in 1971. Conferences were held in Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Rhode Island. In each conference a team of participants was assembled and instructed to observe all activities. The participant team talked informally with other participants and recorded the most prominent concerns and interests expressed. At the conclusion of all sessions, participants were interviewed on a random basis, and the interviews were tape recorded. The evaluator attended conference activities as any other participant and informally interviewed participants. Results of analysis of collected data included the areas of a) freedom as educators and students, b) educational change, c) new roles for teachers and administrators, and d) consciousness of the community. Implications for NEPTE were indicated and six recommendations were offered suggesting a) continuance of conferences of a longer duration, b) student participation in conferences, c) increased representation from school committees, d) further emphasis on issues of planning for and implementing educational change, e) creation of a mechanism for followup of conferences, and f) wider dissemination of information about innovative strategies, policies and methods. The report includes summaries of each state's workshop reports. (MJM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

F-com
SP

ED 063253

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Evaluation of a Series of Five 1971 Teacher Education Workshops Sponsored by the New England Program in Teacher Education

by

The University of New Hampshire's
Division of Continuing Education

February 7, 1972

SP 005 689

TABLE ON CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Individual Workshop Reports	
	1.) New Hampshire Workshop Evaluation Report	ii
	2.) Rhode Island Workshop Evaluation Report	13a
	3.) Maine Workshop Evaluation Report	30
	4.) Vermont Workshop Evaluation Report	51
	5.) Massachusetts Workshop Evaluation Report	64
II.	Generative Themes	81
III.	Implications for NEPTE and Regionalization	88
IV.	Recommendations	92

New Hampshire Workshop Evaluation Report

The following material constitutes a "working report" on the evaluation of the "Teaching in the Open Classroom" workshop held on May 26, 1971, at the Sheraton Wayfarer Motor Inn, Bedford, N. H., and sponsored by the New England Program in Teacher Education. The material below is organized under four categories:

1. Comments on Evaluative Methodology
2. Analysis and Summation of the Questionnaire
3. Summation of Reports of Participant Evaluators Team
4. Summary of Evaluator (S. Langton)

This material is intended as one source for the final evaluation report of the six workshops being sponsored by N.E.P.T.E. and being evaluated by the New Hampshire Division of Continuing Education. It also may by helpful in suggesting alternatives and additions in future workshops.

1. Comments on the Evaluative Methodology

The evaluation methods used during the workshop consisted of the following activities:

a. The use of participant evaluators;
b. The use of tape-recorded interviews and commentary from participants;
c. Observation of trained evaluators; and
d. The use of an evaluative questionnaire.

The participant evaluation team consisted of ten (10) participants who assembled 45 minutes before the conference. Four (4) persons arrived on time, three (3) arrived 15 minutes late, and two (2) arrived at the close of the briefing. One (1) did not show up. The evaluation procedure was explained and all participant evaluators were asked to observe and make notes on the various activities of the conference. A very helpful discussion was then held on what kind of things to observe. The issues

identified by the group included: recurring questions and anxieties; quantity and quality of participant involvement in each activity; major ideas and concerns; the atmosphere and dynamics of each activity group; the behavior of participants; and the approach and style of the leaders of each activity. The participant evaluator team met for a 45-minute discussion at the close of the conference to share information, discuss the important issues, and make recommendations for future conferences.

Three members of the participant evaluation team agreed to use tape recorders to record the views of participants following each session. The two other recorders were to be used by the professional evaluation staff. Since one of the recorders didn't work, only one was utilized. It is interesting to note that the three people who volunteered to use the tape recorders were the oldest and most experienced educators in the participant evaluation group. After these people volunteered, a plan was devised to provide maximum coverage of activities with the tape recorders. At the same time, the tape recorders were loaded and tested with some difficulty. In light of this experience it is recommended that in the future:

1. the people who will use the tape recorders be identified prior to the workshop;
2. a schedule for coverage with tape recorders of the various activities be established with these people prior to the conference;
3. that the tape recorders be loaded, tested, and ready to go before the conference.

This procedure would save considerable time and confusion.

The participant evaluators who used the tape recorders felt that they provided an extremely effective method of data collection. There was

hardly any resistance and resentment to their use. It is felt that this was due to the fact that the entire evaluation process was explained to all participants and it was pointed out that the tape recording was one of several experimental methods being used and, further, no one was required or expected to make comments in the recorders -- their comments would be solicited but they should feel comfortable in declining. Interestingly, very few people declined to comment when solicited.

The observation of the professional evaluator, the participant evaluators, and an analysis of the questionnaire follow. All of these methods are judged to be effective and helpful. The one methodological difficulty involved in this process was that not everyone returned a questionnaire. This was due to the fact that the entire group did not reassemble at the close of the conference. In such an instance in the future, the evaluators should have assistance available to take questionnaires to groups that remain in session and do not return for the closing session. There was little resistance to or resentment of the questionnaire -- most likely because of its brief nature.

2. Analysis and Summation of Evaluative Questionnaire.

The "Evaluation Questionnaire" distributed at the close of the "Open Classroom Workshop" was designed to determine participant attitudes toward the activities, learnings achieved, reasons for attending, and suggestions, if any, for improving the workshop. The questionnaire was further designed to compare the response-differences between students, teachers, administrators, and other pertinent participants in relation to their positions in elementary schools, secondary schools, colleges, universities, or other related educational institutions.

Of those who participated in the workshop, eighty-seven (87) were from New Hampshire, sixty-nine (69) were from Massachusetts, seven (7) from Maine, five (5) from Rhode Island, three (3) from Vermont, and one (1) from Connecticut; this brought the total number of participants to one-hundred-seventy-two (172).

Of the questionnaires returned, eight (8) were from students, fifty-four (54) were from teachers (46 from elementary schools, 8 from colleges), twenty-four (24) from administrators (17 elementary school, 2 college, 3 elementary/secondary, 1 elementary/college, and one museum resource center administrator), and five (5) listed under "other" (1 teacher's aide, 1 researcher, 1 resource center person, and 2 unidentified); this came to a total of ninety-one (91) questionnaire respondents, which is roughly fifty-four percent (54%) of the participants of the workshop.

Schematic Attendance Summary

States	N.H.	Mass.	Maine	R.I.	Ver.	Conn.	Totals
Teachers	33	21	4	1	1	0	60
Principals	15	5	2	1	0	0	23
Teacher Educators	10	7	0	0	0	0	17
Student Teachers	9	8	0	0	0	0	17
Superintendents	3	2	1	1	0	0	7
State Department	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
School Office	5	11	0	2	0	0	18
Community	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Resource Persons	6	10	0	0	2	0	18
Staff	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Miscellaneous	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Evaluators	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
Totals	87	69	7	5	3	1	172

The question was asked, "What workshop activities did you most like?" In response to this question, fourteen (14) participants (including 1 student, 6 elementary school teachers, 2 college teachers, and 3 elementary school administrators) identified the Carini and Howard presentation in the Second Session dealing with assessing current structure and planning gradual change. Thirteen (13) respondents identified the Carini and Howard presentation in the Third Session, which dealt with recording and evaluating individual student progress. Among these respondents were six (6) elementary school teachers, four (4) college teachers, and two (2) elementary school administrators. The multimedia presentation, "Child of Clay", was identified by thirteen (13) respondents, including three (3) elementary school teachers and five (5) elementary school administrators. Nine (9) participants responded that they had enjoyed the presentation "The Integrated Day", which described responsive environment permitting diverse activities; these respondents included one (1) student, five (5) elementary school teachers, and two (2) elementary school administrators. "The Workshop of Things", which implemented experience with educational materials was identified by eight (8) participants, including four (4) elementary school teachers. Other activities identified were the Ipswich and Franklin discussion period in the Fifth Session (5 elementary school teachers); the Nuffield math film, "I Do and I Understand" (3 elementary school administrators and two elementary school teachers); the Shattuck School presentation in the Third Session on humanizing the school and team teaching programs (2 elementary school teachers); informal exchange period in the Fifth Session with Carini, Covell, and McKay (2 elementary school teachers); "Working in an Open School" (1 elementary school teacher and 1 elementary school administrator); the Shatswell School videotape presentation in the Second Session (1 elementary school teacher and 1 elementary school

administrator); and the Horace Mann School presentation of the Third Session which was aimed at the most suitable usage of space for open classroom activities (1 elementary school teacher and 1 elementary school administrator). General, non-specific responses from the participants included "exchange of experiences and ideas", "odd casual conversations with many people", and "Group discussions" (indicated by 4 respondents). All activities included in the workshop were identified at least once as "most liked"with the following three exceptions: the film presentation "High School"; "And Sow Tomorrow", the film presentation in the Fourth Session; and the Shatswell School presentation in the Fourth Session which offered a view of one teacher's approach in free activity.

When asked what activities of the workshop the participants liked the least, many respondents indicated that there were no activities that had met with their disapproval, and fortythree (43) respondents left the space blank. Of those activities identified under this category, the film, "And Sow Tomorrow", was identified by one elementary school teacher and one administrator; the Carini and Howard presentation in the Second Session was identified by two elementary school teachers and one elementary school administrator; the Carini and Howard presentation in the Third Session was identified by one elementary school teacher and one administrator; the Shatswell School videotape presentation in the Second Session was indicated by two elementary school teachers and one elementary school administrator as was "The Workshop of Things"; The Shattuck School presentation of the Third Session by one teacher and one student. Others identified at least once were "I Do and I Understand", "High School", the Horace Mann School presentation of the Third Session, and the discussion period with the teachers from Ipswich and Franklin in the Fifth Session. General responses not dealing with any specific activities included "lack of time",

"open meeting", and those activities showing films or tapes (identified by four respondents); as one respondent explained, "Those showing films because our school can get those at their convenience. People to people contact most important." It is of interest to note here that of the activities identified in the "most liked" category, all were repeated at least once under the"least liked" category with the one exception, "The Integrated Day".

When asked to describe their major learnings from the workshop, fourteen (14) elementary school teachers and four administrators indicated "new ideas" they wished to incorporate in their school systems. Six (6) participants (one college educator, four elementary school teachers, and one college administrator) identified the "problems" of incorporating and continuing under the open classroom concept. There were no other similarities in the responses and it is felt that to list in full the entirety of the responses of the participants is not expedient to this report. Therefore, a random sampling of quotes from the participants follows:

-- "It's really hard to 'talk' about ways to teach children without first settling on common goals. What are they?"

-- "The lyrics are nice but it's hard to dance to."

-- "More reinforcement than initial learning."

-- "In education today the important and significant learning will not come from the textbook."

-- "We don't have all the problems; neither do others have all the answers."

-- "Mostly a strengthening of a belief that individual instruction is at least one answer."

-- "'Space' is both philosophical and physical."

-- "Much yet to be done."

-- "Each opportunity for relating to others working towards a similar end strengthens one's belief in what he's doing or attempting to do in an ' open atmosphere'."

-- "I know we're not alone."

-- "Many educators have a lot of hang-ups to work through."

-- "The general attitude that childrem are human and we as teachers should strive for equality on humanitarian considerations."

-- "You're always going to have differences. These differences are out strengths."

It was the overall response of the participants not currently involved in the open classroom that the major learning had been at least the concept of the open classroom and that they could, given the time, encouragement, and the cooperation of their school systems and communities, effectively implement the change to the open classroom in their school system. To those who had either worked or were working in the open classroom, the indication was that the major learning had been essestially a reinforcement of ideals and motivations, and that the workshop had been more of a refresher course.

When asked, "Why did you come to the workshop?", thirty (30) participants (23 elementary school teachers, 2 college teachers, 2 elementary school administrators, 2 college administrators, and 1 student) indicated that they had "heard of" the open classroom and desired to examine it through the workshop to assess the possibility of instituting the concept in their own systems. Fifteen (15) respondents explained that their system planned to implement the open classroom in the near future and they were there to learn more about it. Among them were ten (10) elementary school teachers, two (2) college teachers, two (2) elementary school administrators, and one (1) elementary/secondary administrator. Five (5) participants expressed the desire to exchange views and ideas with other professionals, and three (3) respondents indicated the desire to "learn something new". Other responses were: "to grow", "interested in change in education", "prospective student teacher", and "desire to see the teacher education process change."

When asked what suggestions they had to offer for improving the workshop, fifteen (15) respondents (including 10 elementary school teachers) identified "more time" to enable the sessions to be longer and also to enable participation in more activities. An additional fifteen (15) participants (including 10 elementary school teachers and 4 elementary school administrators) were in favor of more discussion groups as opposed to stock presentations; as one respondent explained, "Less films, more interaction". Smaller groups were suggested by seven (7) participants, including five (5) elementary school teachers. It was suggested that descriptions of presentations to indicate the age and grade level would be helpful (identified by 5 participants, including 3 elementary school teachers). Other suggestions were: "More 'learning by doing' activities", "contact more colleges to make such a project known," "sprinkle it with experts from without the field", "prevent two activities being in the same room", and "stick to schedules".

Finally, the participants were requested to "use one word describing this workshop". Nine (9) respondents (5 elementary school teachers, two administrators, one student, and a researcher) said that the workshop was "Good". Eight (8) participants described the workshop as "Interesting", among them being six (6) elementary school teachers. An additional eight (8) participants, including 3 elementary school teachers and two college teachers, said that the workshop was"Excellent". And seven (7) respondents (including 4 elementary school teachers) felt that it was "Stimulating". Other responses included "Enlightening", "Helpful", "Creageous", "Beautiful", "Alive", "Eye-opener", "Fruitful", "Input", "Fertilizing", and "Inspirational". Negative responses were "Nebulous", "Up-tight", "Light", and "Tiring", the first three from elementary school teachers and the latter from a secondary school administrator.

3. Summation of Reports of Participant Evaluators

Among the major strengths of the workshop identified in the reports of the participant evaluators are:

-- enthusiasm of leaders

-- specific and practical approaches of many workshops

-- open lunch period and opportunity for interaction

-- receptiveness of many group leaders

-- opportunity for sharing and feeling mutual support

The shortcomings of the workshop identified in the reports are:

-- some people couldn't hear during the opening session

-- there was a need for more "warm up" for discussion at the beginning of the day

-- the "High School" film session was poorly managed -- long silences during reel change, little discussion among adults, and quizzing of high school students in attendance

-- a need for more discussion of the meaning of the "open classroom" concept

-- not enough time

-- groups should have been smaller

The following were identified as major themes and concerns that were expressed by teachers during the workshop:

-- a real need for information to make decisions about instituting the "open classroom" concept, e. g. a great deal of note taking and very practical questions on how to start a program

-- considerable anxiety about community resistance and opposition

-- much interest in grading, testing, measurement, and evaluation (most often expressed by participants who indicated anxiety about community reaction)

-- confusion and uncertainty about the nature and meaning of "open classroom" concept -- is it attitude, design, activities, environment, et. al.
-- great interest in para-professionals (aides) and concern over correct and effective use of them
-- many expressions of need for support for instituting change
-- concern regarding pleasing parents and providing traditional alternatives for children whose parents oppose the concept
-- interest in criteria for grouping students

4. Evaluator's Summary

In light of the above information, discussion with the participant evaluators, and observation of workshop activities, the following points of summation and recommendations are outlined below:

a. The workshop was very successful. There was a high degree of participant satisfaction (evidenced in questionnaire in particular)
b. There appeared to be four predominant attitudes among participants:
   (1) those who were not convinced of the value of open classroom and came to raise critical questions
   (2) those who wanted to institute open classroom concept but were having difficulty with their administration
   (3) those who had instituted open classroom and wanted to share and compare with others
   (4) those who were being pressured by their administrator into instituting open classroom concept but were uncertain and unprepared to do so
c. The concept of "Open Classroom" is a diverse term and there is considerable confusion and difference of opinion as to its meaning.

The workshop really did not allow for in-depth discussion of this issue; however, many participants expressed interest in pursuing it

d. A prominent theme among participants was anxiety concerning community reaction and opposition to instituting open classroom concepts.

e. A related area of anxiety expressed frequently had to do with colleague reception or opposition to the implementation of open classroom concepts

f. It was interesting to note that much less discussion was directed to how children felt about open classrooms whereas considerable attention was devoted to teacher and community attitudes

g. The most important concern expressed regarding children was what happens to them if they have been involved in an open classroom and later enter a more traditional learning environment

h. There was a very limited representation among secondary school teachers and students. It appears that a workshop specifically designed for their interests and needs would be appropriate in the future.

i. A number of principals expressed the feeling that it would be helpful to meet with other principals to consider issues and problems of administrations in instituting and implementing changes such as open classroom concept. This suggests an area for future programming

j. It was not possible for everyone to take advantage of all learning activities. Many participants suggested that the workshop be longer. It is very likely that a repeat workshop, with some changes, would attract many participants and their colleagues

k. It was noted that most activities did not end on time and participants

indicated interest in longer sessions. It is recommended that discussion-oriented sessions be longer

l. It is recommended that initial regional cluster groups be smaller and that more time be spent identifying needs, interests, and concerns during these initial sessions

m. Because of the short time period for various sessions, a number of discussions were dominated by one or two people. It is recommended that group procedures be designed to avoid this possibility in the future.

n. It was difficult to bring participants back together at the close of the workshop. As a result the workshop gradually "evaporated". It is recommended that an attractive closing event be included for a closing session.

* * * * *

What follows constitutes an evaluation report on the "Open Concept Schooling Workshop" held on June 2, 1971, at the Colonial Hilton Inn, in Cranston, Rhode Island. The comments on evaluative methodology made in conjunction with the New Hampshire Workshop also apply to the Rhode Island workshop evaluation.

Rhode Island Workshop Evaluation Report

The evaluation report on the Rhode Island Workshop is organized under three categories:

1) Analysis and Summation of the Questionnaire

2) Summation of Reports of Participant Evaluators Team

3) Summary of Evaluator (J. DeWitt)

There were one hundred sixty (160) participants, twenty two (22) resource persons, four (4) staff and two (2) evaluators, making a total of one hundred eighty eight (188) conferees at the NEPTE workshop on open-concept schooling in Cranston, Rhode Island, on June 2, 1971.

Of the one hundred eighty eight (188) conferees, seventy eight (78) were from Rhode Island, seventy nine (79) were from Massachusetts, twenty (20) were from Connecticut, seven (7) were from Maine, and none were from Vermont.

Seventy one (71) of the one hundred sixty (160) participants, or 44% returned completed workshop evaluation questionnaires. Of these respondents, forty two (42) are teachers --thirty nine (39) elementary, three (3) secondary-- twenty three (23) are administrators, and six (6) classify themselves as "other". Of these six (6), two (2) identify themselves as counsellors in secondary schools. One (1) as a secondary school "change agent" and one (1) as a university researcher.

What follows is a schematic attendance summary:

Schematic Attendance Summary

States	R.I.	Mass.	Conn.	Maine	N.H.	Total
Teacher	47	25	3	6	0	81
Principal	12	14	8	1	0	35
Teacher Educator	1	2	4	0	0	7
Student Teacher	1	4	0	0	0	5
Superintendent	3	8	0	0	0	11
State Department	0	2	0	0	0	2
School Office Staff	5	8	0	0	0	13
Community	0	2	0	0	0	2
Resource Person	4	14	4	0	0	22
Staff	0	1	0	0	3	4
Board Member	0	(1)*	0	0	0	(1)
Evaluator	0	0	1	0	1	2
Miscellaneous	3	1	0	0	0	4
Total	76	81	20	7	4	188

*(also counted as community)

The question was asked: "What workshop activities did you most like?" In response to this question, thirty one (31) respondents --including twentyfour (24) teachers and seven (7) administrators-- identified the Multi-Instructional Area: Community as Resource presentation made by Charles Senteio's resource team from the Waverly School. Thirteen (13) respondents --eight (8) teachers, four (4) administrators, and one (1) classified as "other"-- identified the Project COD presentation made by William Page and several teachers. Nine (9) respondents --six (6) teachers

and three (3) administrators-- identified the Integrated Day presentation made by Masha Rudman, Peter Wilson and Peggy George. Six (6) respondents --five (5) administrators and one (1) classified as "other"-- identified John Washburn's presentation on School Organization for the Open Classroom. Five (5) respondents --three (3) teachers and two (2) administrators-- identified the Organization of an Open School presentation made by Beatrice Donovan, Esther Feldman and Gertrude Sullivan. Four (4) respondents --one (1) teacher, two (2) administrators and one (1) counsellor-- identified the Organizing for Change presentations made by Arthur Bennett of the North Dartmouth High School. None of the respondents identified the Workshop of Things or the films "I do and I Understand", and "High School". Two (2) respondents did not answer the question and one (1) specified "informal discussions" as the workshop activity most liked.

What follows is a schematic summary of data for question one:

Schematic Summary of Data for Question One

Presentation	Teachers	Administrators	Other	Totals
Multi-Instructional Area: Community as Resource	24	7	0	31
Project COD	8	4	1	13
Integrated Day	6	3	0	9
School Organization for the Open Classroom	0	5	1	6
Organization of an Open School	3	2	0	5
Organizing for Change	1	2	1	4
Workshop of Things	0	0	0	0
"I Do and I Understand" (film)	0	0	0	0
"High School" (film)	0	0	0	0
Blank	0	0	2	2
Other	0	0	1	1
Totals	42	23	6	71

When asked: "What workshop activities did you like the least?" twenty two (22) of the seventy one (71) respondents left the answer blank. Seventeen (17) of these twenty two (22) respondents were teachers, four (4) were administrators, and one (1) was a counsellor in a secondary school.

Eighteen (18) of the seventy one (71) respondents did not mention any presentation as least liked. Five (5) of these respondents avoided giving negative comments, constructive or otherwise. One teacher, for example, wrote, "I enjoyed them all and learned from each one." Another teacher commented: "I liked everything quite well and I did not really like anything

the least." One administrator responded: "Loved all!" Another administrator said "Cannot think of any."

The remaining thirteen (13) of these eighteen (18) respondents gave negative comments constructively. For example, four (4) administrators observed that the acoustics in the Empire room were poor. And five (5) teachers commented that two presentations being given simultaneously in the Empire Room made for confusion and that in the future concurrent scheduling in the same room should be avoided. These are interesting observations, considering that the very theme of the workshop was "open concept schooling". Other usefully given negative comments were:

-- Impossible to hear

-- Too many workshops to go to at the same time

-- Waiting to register

-- Not enough time allowed for discussion in the focus groups

Twelve (12) respondents --five (5) teachers and seven (7) administrators-- named the "Organization of an Open School" (Donovan, Feldman, and Sullivan) as the least liked presentation.

Six (6) respondents --four (4) teachers, one (1) administrator, and one (1) secondary school counsellor-- designated the "School Organization for Open Classrooms" (John Washburn) as the least liked presentation.

Five (5) respondents --five (5) teachers-- named the "Workshop of Things" as the least useful presentation.

Three (3) respondents --one (1) teacher and two (2) administrators-- said "The Integrated Day" (Rudman, Wilson and George) was the presentation they liked the least.

Three (3) respondents --all administrators-- designated "Organizing for Change" (Bennett and students) as the least useful presentation.

One (1) respondent, an administrator, mentioned "Project COD" (Page and teachers) as the presentation liked the least.

One (1) respondent, a secondary school counsellor, named the film presentation, "I do and I Understand", as the least liked presentation.

It is significant that none of the seventy one (71) respondents mentioned the "High School" film presentation as most or least liked, and even more significant that none of the respondents designated the "Multi-Instructional Area: Community as Resource" (Senteio) presentation as least liked.

Schematic Summary of Data for Question Two

Presentation	Teachers	Administrators	Other	Totals
Blank	17	4	1	22
Other	10	5	3	18
Organization of an Open School (Donovan, Feldman, Sullivan)	5	7	0	12
School Organization for the Open Classroom (Washburn)	4	1	1	6
Workshop of Things	5	0	0	5
Integrated Day (Rudman, Wilson, George)	1	2	0	3
Organizing for Change	0	3	0	3
Project COD	0	1	0	1
"I Do and I Understand" (film)	0	0	1	1
"High School" (film)	0	0	0	0
Multi-Instructional Area: Community as Resource (Senteio)	0	0	0	0
Totals	42	23	6	71

When asked to state briefly the major learnings from the workshop, three (3) respondents --one (1) elementary school administrator, one (1) elementary school teacher and one (1) secondary school counsellor-- left the answer blank. The remaining sixty eight (68) respondents state major learnings that can be classified as cognitive, affective and practical. The cognitive or theoretical learnings strongly predominated (e.g. 63 of the 68 responses to this question gave major learnings that are theoretical as contrasted with affective and practical) and there was no significant differences in the responses of administrators, teachers or those classified as "others".

For example, a university researcher wrote "Everyone uses (the term) 'open-concept' in a different way. I'm troubled. Do we think this is a gimmick or a panacea?" An Administrator wrote: "I see now that the concept of an open school varies tremendously." A teacher wrote, "There is too much misunderstanding on the part of teachers as to the idea of open-concept schooling. For example, some feel this is fine only for schools with very large open areas."

More than fifty (50) responses to this question mentioned major learnings that were clarifications with regard to the great variety of meanings brought to the terms "open classrooms" and "open schools". A random sampling of such remarks are:

-- Real teamwork among teachers is necessary for an open school.

-- An open school is possible despite architecture.

-- Open classrooms can work with disadvantaged children.

-- Open schools do have structure and constant evaluation.

-- The open school is not unique <u>per se</u> but is tempered with traditional structures.

-- Structure is very important, even in open schools.

-- Open space needs and relies on "structure", boundaries and trust from the child through administration and community.

-- Curriculum is less important than the traditional classroom situation will allow or has allowed.

A conclusion reached on the basis of using these categories: theory, affect, and practice, to classify the respondents' answers to the question about major learnings is that there was a great deal of confusion and ignorance among the workshop population in regard to the meaning of open concept schooling and that some of the confusion was cleared up. Moreover, an analysis of the responses classified as "affective" indicates that there is considerable anxiety among both teachers and administrators who are not directly involved in open concept schooling at the present time, and that they feel that they would be or will be expected to change from "closed" to "open" without the opportunity for humane and carefully planned preparation to do so.

For example, one teacher spoke for many by commenting: "The whole movement from traditional to new and open is a process that teachers along with others should decide on -- the rate of change."

On the other hand, a significant number --seventeen (17)-- of respondents who are presently involved in open classes and open schools indicated anxiety that they felt somewhat alone, and that their efforts were not being understood or appreciated and supported by their professional colleagues who are not presently involved in open schooling activities.

The individuals in this group felt less alone in their efforts, better understood, and thus more supported at least within the workshop situation. Some of their comments are as follows:

-- Confirmed free teaching approach.

-- We (i.e. at an open school) are much better off than I realized.

-- There are many people (who are) enthusiastic about the open concept.

-- There are other teachers who are happy in their open classroom. situation.

-- The widespread looking for overall approval of open classrooms.

-- I am enormously re-assured that (my) efforts in the open concept classroom are useful to others.

-- Our own school is on the right track.

-- What we are trying to do can be done.

-- People really do believe open schools can and should work.

-- There is no <u>one</u> way. Openness is important. Implementation can take many forms.

The basic conclusion underlying the data on "major learnings" from the workshop is that there is a widespread need for clarification and understanding of the meanings brought to the terms "open classrooms" and "open schools." It is probable that this need for clarification is quite deep, because it emerged as the major, if underlying, concern of most of the participants even though the event was a workshop (i.e. meant to deal with "how" rather than "what" issues).

Finally, perhaps the most disturbing response to the "major learnings" question came from a respondent whose role and institution was identified as "other". The response --community participation is still regarded as somewhat exotic-- suggests that both teachers and administrators derive whatever social authority they have from the particular community or communities that they serve, but that in practice, this is rarely recognized.

When asked: "Why did you come to the workshop?" ten (10) respondents --six (6) teachers and four (4) administrators-- replied that they wanted to know what others in the region were doing in regard to open school implementation.

-- To see what is going on the area

-- to exhange ideas and experiences

-- to get an area overview (e.g. New England) and evaluation of the open school concept

-- to dialogue with colleagues

In this regard, one respondent classified as "other" commented: "To learn how NEPTE is doing and to find out more about current thinking among teachers."

Twenty nine (29) respondents --twenty (20) teachers and nine (9) administrators-- indicated that they came primarily for clarification, or "to learn more about what open-concept schooling actually is," as one teacher put it.

Fifteen (15) respondents --seven (7) teachers and eight (8) administrators-- indicated that they were already involved in open concept schooling in their back home situation and that they had come both to see how they were doing and to get ideas and strategies for practical improvement.

Nineteen (19) respondents --thirteen (13) teachers and six (6) administrators said they came because they will be involved next year in implementing open concept schooling in their back home situation.

One secondary school teacher commented flatly that the superintendent had ordered his (or her) attendance at the workshop. An educational researcher stated: "I was sent for reasons not yet clear to me." Perhaps the most telling response was made by an elementary school teacher who wrote: "To see if (anyone from) Rhode Island would come." With the exception

of the "Rhode Island remark", the responses to this question do not differ appreciably from those made to the same question at the first (i.e. New Hampshire) workshop.

When asked what suggestions they had for improving the workshop, five (5) respondents --three (3) teachers, one (1) administrator and one (1) counsellor-- had no suggestions.

Twenty one (21) responses --eleven (11) administrators, eight (8) teachers and two (2) others-- were concerned with having more appropriate physical facilities for future workshops and more careful local planning with regard to physical details. Three (3) of these twenty one (21) responses mentioned that the morning registration procedure should have been more effectively planned. ("No reason why we should have had to wait so long in line to register." "Registration could just as easily have been done by groups or geographical area." "Waiting to register was a handicap and made it impossible to start on time.") Other comments about physical facilities were:

-- Noisy initial session
-- Crowded physical facilities
-- The long registration line made it impossible to start on time
-- Better acoustics if there is to be more than one group to a room
-- Provide separate areas for each discussion group
-- Don't run two workshops in the same room
-- The focus room was too noisy--discussion groups should have separate rooms
-- Have smaller discussion groups and have a trained discussion leader for each group
-- More affective use of small groups
-- Have better group meeting facilities

Eight (8) indicated that either the workshop should be longer so every participant could interact with each presentation or to have fewer presentations. Seven (7) participants called for more time for small group discussion. Three (3) asked for more detailed advance publicity, and only one (1) participant called for more student participation.

Two (2) administrators focused on shortcomings of resource persons. One said: "Next time, screen (presentation) activities and the local persons giving them more carefully." The other stated: "Do all you can to prevent any one resource person from dominating any section of the program." Two (2) teachers asked that those teachers attending the workshop who are actually participating in open classrooms should have spoken.

Several respondents asked that more secondary school people be included and that there is a widespread need for open-concept workshops for secondary school teachers and administrators. Not suprisingly, there were several "anti theory" suggestions (e.g. "Keep away from theory -- make everything practical", and "no general palaver".)

Finally, respondents were requested to use one word to describe the workshop. Of the seventy one (71) respondents, seven (7) --six (6) elementary school teachers and one (1) administrator-- left the space blank. One (1) elementary school teacher made a negative remark -- "imbroglio" (sic) -- and one administrator had a negative response (i.e. "inadequate"). The remaining sixty two (62) comments were positive, and there was no discernable difference between those of teachers, administrators and "others". For example, "informative" (10),"good" (8), "stimulating" (6), "excellent" (5), "tremendous" (3), "great" (2). Other comments were "encouraging", "needed", "enlightening", "profitable", "worthwhile", "supportive", "reassuring", "practical", "well planned", "well done". There were eighteen (18) requests

for more workshops on open schooling. One teacher commented: "Our Superintendent was here and said: 'Let's not wait. Let's start.'"

Summation of Reports of Participant Observers

The major strengths of the workshop identified by participant observers are:

-- It identified anxiety that school people feel about the open school concept and reality.

-- It clarified the many meanings of open concept schooling.

-- It provided a needed overview of what is being done in the New England Region.

-- It provided an opportunity to share with colleagues.

-- It uncovered needs for further clarification and implementation sessions both for elementary and secondary school personnel.

Some shortcomings of the Rhode Island workshop identified by the participant observers were:

-- Registration procedure (e.g. waiting) and physical facilities (e.g. acoustics) detracted from the workshop design.

-- An absence of trained discussion leaders.

-- Discussion groups should be smaller.

-- Student participation was minimal.

-- Not enough time for participants to get to all the presentations.

In addition to the ten above mentioned observations, the group of participant observers also made every major observation about the strengths and weaknesses of the workshop that were made by the participants themselves by way of the questionnaire.

The major themes and concerns identified by the participant observers were exactly the same at the second workshop as they were at the first.

Evaluator's Summary

In the light of the above information on the Rhode Island Workshop, and as a result of discussion with participant evaluators of that workshop with NEPTE staff, and with the evaluator of the New Hampshire Workshop, the following summary points and recommendations are made:

Generally, the Rhode Island workshop was successful. This is evident by analysis of the questionnaire data as well as the high degree of participant satisfaction. However, this workshop was evidently not as successful as the earlier New Hampshire workshop because, comparatively speaking, the level of collaboration between the NEPTE staff and local personnel both in planning and implementation was conspicuously lower in the Rhode Island workshop than it was in the New Hampshire workshop. This was in evidence in the selection of physical facilities, in registration procedures, and in the selection of several resource persons who made presentations at the Rhode Island workshop.

The overwhelmingly positive response to the person and presentation of Mr. Charles Senteio points to the conclusion that Mr. Senteio and the issues with which he deals, as well as how he deals with them, bear very close attention for educators.

When homely and humble details of workshop and conference planning are not done carefully and seriously executed, what is least conspicuous (i.e. adequate physical facilities --e.g. enough rooms, appropriate size, adequate acoustics, well organized registration and procedure) becomes most important in a negative way.

The structure of the Rhode Island workshop suffered some of the same shortcomings as the New Hampshire workshop. That is, the discussion groups were too large. They did not have enough time. Nor were competent discussion facilitators utilized. Moreover, the Rhode Island workshop design

included a viewing of several films, which diminished useful interaction among participants. It is suggested that the use of films (especially fairly long ones) at workshops is counterproductive if one believes that a high degree of participant interaction is desirable.

The Rhode Island workshop evidenced the same imbalance in overwhelming numerical favor of elementary school personnel and against secondary school personnel. It is now fairly clear that there is a need for open concept workshops for secondary school personnel at least in New Hampshire and Rhode Island, if not throughout New England.

Although concern or anxiety about community participation or reaction to the movement from closed to open schools and classrooms was much higher at the New Hampshire workshop than it was in Rhode Island, it is suspected that the issue of genuine community participation in the planning and implementation of institutional change in Rhode Island schools will very soon become a live issue as soon as more Rhode Island schools move from closed to open.

Further, the closure of the Rhode Island workshop was, at best, diffused, as it was with the New Hampshire workshop. The earlier recommendation that an attractive and appropriate event be designed for closure in future workshops is here repeated.

Furthermore, and significantly, the expressed need for clarification of the concept of "open classrooms" and "open schools" at the Rhode Island workshop, and the expressed anxiety of participants regarding the whole movement from "closed" to "open" (i.e. anxiety by those <u>not</u> currently involved that they will be forced to move from closed to open without preparation, and anxiety by those who <u>are</u> currently involved that their progress and efforts are not understood or supported) at both workshops

suggests a real need for both clarification sessions and sessions for the collaborative development of institutional change strategies in the future.

Finally, it is suggested that because the Rhode Island workshop was held so quickly after the New Hampshire workshop it was impossible to include in the planning process of the Rhode Island workshop those learnings from the New Hampshire workshop.

In conclusion, Arthur Bennett's "Organizing for Change" presentation dealt with the complexities of developing a collaborative and communal change strategy for a high school. But because of both perspectival deficiencies and a widespread ignorance of and innocence of organization and community development concepts and skills on the part of most of the workshop participants exposed to the presentation, the potential depth and breadth of the "Organizing for Change" presentation was not very well understood. On the other hand, Mr. Bennett himself did not evidence adequate familiarity with the fields of organizational development and community organization, even though the South Dartmouth"Organizing for Change" project is precisely an OD-CO project. One would speculate that the development of a structural perception of the complexities of moving from closed to open schooling among school people is the deepest and most neglected need uncovered by the two workshops to date.

Maine Workship Evaluation Report

The "TEPS" Teacher Evaluation Conference of the Maine Teachers Association held at the Fenway Motor Hotel in Waterville, Maine on 15-16 October, 1971, was planned and implemented by the Maine Teachers Association. NEPTE's involvement was limited to partial financial support ($500) of the total workshop cost and provision for external evaluation of the conference.

What follows is an evaluative report of this "TEPS" conference. The report is organized under four categories.

1.) Comments on evaluative methodology

2.) The conference schedule and content agenda

3.) Analysis and summary of the questionnaire

4.) Summary of evaluator (J. DeWitt)

1.) Comments on the Evaluative Methodology

Because the actual conference planning was already done entirely by the Maine Teachers Association before NEPTE or the evaluation team was involved, the evaluative methodology is necessarily limited to the use of an evaluative questionnaire and observations of the participating evaluator. For the use of tape-recorded interviews and a team of participant evaluators, demands involvement in the planning process itself.

2.) Conference Schedule and Content Agenda

The conference schedule and content agenda are included only as sources of information for the NEPTE staff and Board of Directors.

a.) Conference Schedule

TEPS CONFERENCE
Fenway Maine Motor Hotel
Waterville, Maine
October 15-16

(Conference Schedule continued)

THEME: "TEACHER EVALUATION - WHAT'S IN THE WIND?"

Friday, October 15

4:30 - 6:00 p.m.	Registration
6:00	Dinner
7:00	Overview of the Conference - John Margarones, Chairman, MTA TEPS Committee
7:15	President's Message - Spencer Trask, MTA President
7:30	"TEPS In The 70's - The Challenge For The Profession" Girard Hottleman, Director Educational Services Mass. Teachers Association
	Table Discussions
9:00	Adjournment

Saturday, October 16

7:30 - 8:30 a.m.	Buffet Breakfast
8:45	Presentation Of The Denver Plan For Teacher Appraisal Dr. John Marvin, Geneva Kirk, Spencer Trask
10:00	Coffee Break
10:30	Demonstrations On Implementing The Denver Plan Elementary - Secondary Urban - Rural Participant Interaction Geneva Kirk
11:30	Reaction Panel
12:00	"What The Local TEPS Chairman Can Do" J. Don Belleville, Director, Northern UNISERV District
12:30	"A Profession In Crisis" - David Bustin, MTA Association Executive Secretary
12:45	Conference Wrap-Up - John Margarones
1:00	Luncheon and Adjournment

b.) Content Agenda

DENVER PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DIVISION OF PERSONNEL SERVICES

TEACHER PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

JANUARY 1971

APPRAISAL: The process by which continuous improvement of instruction is affected through improving the performance of the teacher

1. Need for Appraisal

The master teacher is not a happy accident but the result of a thoughtful approach to the many-faceted teaching-learning process. Innovative programs, good facilities appropriate materials and modern working conditions, may contribute to but do not guarantee quality education. The key to excellence in education is the teacher who continually assesses the effectiveness of his teaching against educationally defensible, predetermined goals and adjusts his performance as needed to assure excellence of results.

Major emphasis in the appraisal process must be on performance and its effects rather than on the teacher as a person. Over 92% of teachers surveyed by the NEA Research Division in 1969 favored appraisal as a means of improving teaching competence indicating a felt need for continual improvement of performance.

II. Purposes of Appraisal

The focus of appraisal is directed toward improving the quality of instruction through:

A. Evaluating the quality of teaching performance
B. Determining aspects of teaching performance needing improvement and providing assistance
C. Establishing continuous communication and mutual concern between teacher and appraiser
D. Identifying effective aspects of teaching performance
E. Increasing teacher job satisfaction
F. Providing a record of progress

III. Appraisers

Historically the principal has had the sole responsibility for teacher appraisal. Increasing demands upon the principal's time and energy, the growing complexity of the education enterprise, the size of faculties, and the professionalism of

teachers makes it imperative that the number of persons involved in the appraisal process be increased and that the principal be assisted in carrying out the appraisal process. The following generalization will be used by the principal in the selection of persons to be involved in the appraisal of teachers:

> The principal may request assistance with teacher appraisal from administrative personnel assigned to his school, (Assistant Principal, Dean, Coordinator,) curriculum specialists, other principals, supervisors from the central administration offices, or from tenure teachers who will usually be department or grade level chairmen assigned to his school. Teachers will be informed in advance of persons who will participate in their appraisal.

The criteria to be used in the selection of personnel to assist with appraisal are:

A. Persons who will assist with appraisal will -

1. Be thoroughly oriented to the appraisal process
2. Have time which can be provided in place of other assignments within present staff allocations to conduct conferences and observations, to be observed, and to do demonstration teaching in their field of competency.

3. Summarize their appraisal comments in writing with signature affixed for the principal's records and for the perusal and signature of the teacher being appraised.

4. Work at the direction of the principal and be solely responsible to the principal for the parts of the appraisal process as directed by the principal.

Although the principal may request assistance in the appraisal process, final responsibility for appraisal will remain with the principal. Further, the principal will have the constraints of working within presently allocated staff numbers and the process of appraisal as stated herein.

IV. The Appraisal Process

The need for appraisal can be agreed upon by teachers and administrators when appraisal is discussed in rather broad and abstract terms. The key to continued agreement and the improvement of performance lies in the process, methods and instruments of appraisal.

The process of appraisal must recognize that we live in a society in which biological needs and economic security

needs have largely been met. People no longer perform with excellence at work because of fears of starving or of not having a job. It is evident that a substantial raise in pay is not necessarily of motivating force. Appraisal must function at a level where the social (sharing ideas and finding common interests) and ego (who is best?) needs of individuals are met.

Administrators who desire to function as a motivating force have often adopted a "pat on the back-you can do it" approach. This"positive" approach may obtain better results than the "do it or else" approach in the short run. Administrators often fail to realize that the "pat on the back" creates an unhealthy need on people because the person who responds to the "pat on the back" then has a need for the administrator to continue the technique and the person is still substituting an outside force for self goal setting and self measurement of success. The administrator is trapped into setting goals and measuring progress for other people and in so doing creates an unhealthy dependency and an ineffective teacher. Now the stage is set for the most prevalent norm of managing: management by anxiety. Since goal setting and progress measuring are taking place outside the teacher and goals are most often discussed in broad and unmeasurable terms or not at all, the teacher is left in a state of anxiety which is expressed in simple terms: "What does the principal want?" It is astounding that the answer to that question is seldom sought from the principal!

The usual method of discovering what the principal wants is through questioning other teachers. The variety of answers and attitudes from other teachers then creates further anxiety. Psychologiest have demonstrated that anxiety creates less thinking, loss of memory, decreased learning, and ego awareness. If the teacher attempts to function in terms of ill-defined goals, then personal worth, as measured by the principal, is based on elimination of error in proceeding toward ill-defined goals. If elimination of error looms large in the teacher's mind, then apathy and no risk taking will become standard modes of operation and the classic defense systems operate:

A. Withdrawal
   High rate of absenteeism, tardiness, no expression of ideas
B. Rationalization
   The principal is stupid. The principal doesn't like me
C. Projection
   Other people are causing the problem

However, high achievers function best when they have:

A. Freedom to pursue mutually agreed upon significant goals and methods

B. Personal responsibility for accomplishments
C. Opportunity to set moderately risky goals
D. Prompt, candid and meaningful feed back on performance
E. Consistent recognition for jobs well done
F. An atmosphere of support and encouragement when needed skills, assistance, and information are provided.

The process of appraisal should contribute to the development of high achievement and utilize the ways in which high achievers function. Conversely, the process should identify teachers who are incapable of setting significant goals, of devising methods of progress toward those goals and of accepting personal responsibility for accomplishment.

V. Appraisal Procedure

The teacher and the appraiser must accept equal responsibility for accomplishing the appraisal process. The procedure for implementing teacher appraisal will involve the following steps:

A. Stating mutually agreed upon measurable goals
B. Devising means of accomplishing the goals
C. Determining methods of evaluating progress toward goals
D. Planning for communication between the teacher and the appraiser
E. Providing for keeping of permanent records
F. Summarizing progress in appraisal statements by the principal

Stating Mutually Agreed Upon Measurable Goals

Early in each semester, the teacher to be appraised will produce a statement of goals in terms that provide for measurement of progress and will submit the statement to the appraiser for suggestions and agreement. Agreement should be reached as rapidly as possible. Such a statement will become a permanent part of the appraisal document. Broad areas of teaching responsibility should be identified and redefined so that specific aspects may be stated for appraisal. Some broad areas to be considered might include:

Lesson planning
Unit planning
Motivating
Managing classroom control
Individualizing instruction
Student achievement
Evaluating student progress
Communicating
Providing an attractive learning environment
Reporting to parents
Staff relationships
Parent conferences

(This list is not meant to be all inclusive)

Once the broad areas have been agreed upon, then specific aspects which need strengthening should be defined. For example: the statement "student discipline should improve," does not meet the criterion of stating a measurable goal. Both teacher and appraiser must seek to define specific kinds of teacher behavior which effect pupil performance. The following should be considered when goals are being stated:

1. Identify the expected teacher behavior by name: you can specify the behavior that will be accepted as evidence that the goal has been achieved.

2. Attempt to define the desired behavior further by describing the significant conditions under which the behavior will be expected to occur.

3. Specify the criteria of acceptable performance by describing how well the person must perform to be considered acceptable.

It is not necessary to include all three items in each goal, however, item three must always be included to set a standard of performance.

To test for a clearly written goal, ask the following question:

Can another competent person select successful behavior in terms of the goal so that the writer of the goal would agree?

It should be recognized that the stating of measurable goals will necessarily be a thoughtful and time consuming process, but once clearly defined goals have been stated, the implementation of the reminder of the appraisal process should proceed smoothly. Final appraisal must be based on the accomplishment of goals.

The major responsibility for goal setting must move from the appraiser to the teacher during the probationary period. The first appraisal may be based on goals suggested by the appraiser based on the appraiser's knowledge of the needs of new teachers. These goals may center around classroom management, planning, use of time and materials and other areas where new teachers need to develop skills rapidly. Subsequent appraisals should reflect increasing in-put from the teacher. At the conclusion of the probationary period, the teacher should be an independent, goal setting professional.

In order to provide a standard of non-compliance, goals should be set with a minimum and maximum range of accomplishment stated. The teacher will be expected to accomplish the minimum progress stated to be evaluated as competent. Lack of accomplishment may lead to a restatement of goals in more realistic or specific terms.

Devising Means of Accomplishing the Goals

After goals have been set, the teacher will submit an outline of steps to be taken to accomplish the goals and a specific date by which the stated progress will be measurable. The plan will include such things as: materials needed and available, instructional techniques, provisions for constant feed back concerning progress, resource persons, grouping, and teacher study. This plan will be reviewed by the appraiser who may make additional suggestions. After the plan has been discussed, the teacher will make needed revisions and submit one copy to the appraiser as part of the appraisal record. All goals and plans for accomplisment are subject to review by the principal.

Determining Methods of Evaluating Progress Toward Goals

The goals and the means of accomplishment will suggest techniques and instruments for evaluating progress toward goals. The teacher will tentatively determine the most appropriate devices for use in continuous evaluation and the evidence of progress which should be recorded. The appraiser will review the plan for evaluation with the teacher, make necessary suggestions and receive a copy of the plan for the appraisal record.

Planning for Communication

Since the teacher and appraiser must accept equal responsibility for the appraisal of performance, it is imperative that frequent communication take place. Both persons will be responsible for initiating conferences and classroom observations. The teacher must seek assistance with problems that develop, and the appraiser must be alert for additional methods, materials, and suggestions which will contribute to progress. The successful implementation of the appraisal process will depend, in large measure, upon the openness and effectiveness of the two-way communication between the teacher and the appraiser. A written record of all observations and conferences should be kept so that the focus on goals is clear. A summary of progress noted, suggestions, etc. should be prepared by the appraiser with a copy for the teacher. These succinct summaries should help determine next steps in assisting the teacher toward success. The teacher must also frequently submit statements which will provide evidence of progress as shown by the evaluation methods agreed upon.

Summarizing Progress in Appraisal Statements

The preparation of the final appraisal document to be submitted to the central offices by the principal must be done in relation to the due date of the appraisal document and the date set in the plan for accomplishing the goals.

Scheduled conferences to discuss the completion of the appraisal form should be initiated by either the teacher or the appraiser. The conferences should be at a time and of such length as to assure a thorough and meaningful review of progress toward goals. The conferences should also serve as a beginning point for further goal setting.

The comments on the appraisal form from the teacher and the appraiser should center around goals and their accomplishment. The final recommendation of the principal must be based on the teacher's ability to set meaningful goals, devise means of accomplishing the goals and measure progress toward those goals.

3.) Analysis and Summary of the Questionnaire

There were 65 returned questionnaires from a total of about 100 conferees. The roles of these respondants and their institutions is as follows:

34 Teachers
- 16 Elementary school teachers
- 16 Secondary school teachers
- 1 College teacher
- 1 Teacher (no institution checked)

14 Administrators
- 6 Elementary school administrators
- 6 Secondary school administrators
- 1 Administrator for both Elementary and Secondary
- 1 Administrator (no institution checked)

4 Parents

4 School Directors

3 Board Members

2 Elementary school teacher-administrators

2 Secondary school counselors

1 School committeeman

1 "Other"

First the question was asked, "What did you like most about this workshop?" The break down of the responses is as follows:

13 - The discussion, interaction, questions and answers: 4 administrators, 4 teachers, 2 school board members, 1 teacher-administrator, 1 parent & 1 school committeeman

11 - Panel discussion (role playing): 8 teachers, 2 administrators, & 1 teacher-administrator

10 - Active interest and participation: 6 teachers, 1 administrator, 1 teacher-administrator, 1 school director & 1 counselor

9 - Know more about evaluation: 4 teachers, 3 administrators, 1 school board administrator & 1 school committeeman

6 - Work together and include others to improve education: 3 teachers, 2 administrators & 1 parent

5 - Friday evening's program (G. Hottleman): 4 teachers & 1 counselor

5 - Demonstration: 2 parents, 1 director, 1 administrator & 1 parent

4 - Hearing of Denver Plan: 4 teachers

3 - Informative: 1 "other", 1 teacher-administrator, & 1 administrator

2 - Clarification of MTA: 2 teachers

2 - Time well planned: 1 teacher & 1 teacher-administrator

2 - Mrs. Kirk's contribution: 2 teachers

1 - Problem-solution method: 1 teacher

1 - Frankness of speaker (TEPS): 1 administrator

1 - Dr. Marvin's speech: 1 teacher

1 - Theme: 1 administrator

1 - Good speakers: 1 administrator

1 - 1/2 day workshop: 1 administrator

1 - Relevance: 1 teacher

1 - "Nothing in particular": 1 teacher

1 - Blank: 1 director

Next the participants were asked to tell what they liked least about the workshop.

24 - Too little space, poor facilities and audio: 9 teachers, 9 administrators, 2 teacher-administrators, 2 counselors, 1 parent & 1 school board member

11 - Too little time: 8 teachers, 2 administrators & 1 board member

9 - Blank: 3 teachers, 2 parents, 1 director, 1 school board administrator, 1 administrator & 1 "other"

5 - Friday night's speaker: 4 teachers & 1 administrator

3 - Speakers should have been extemporary and not just repeated what was written: 1 director, 1 counselor & 1 administrator

2 - Too much time spent on negatives and personal gripes: 2 teachers

2 - Denver Plan and its presentation predominated: 2 teachers

1 - Lecture: 1 teacher

1 - No role groups to show severe conflict: 1 teacher

1 - Reaction panel: 1 teacher

1 - No small group discussion: 1 administrator

1 - Some of it was unrealistic: 1 teacher

1 - Topic was too large: 1 administrator

1 - Defensive positions by teachers and administrators: 1 director

1 - Need more reference to real examples: 1 teacher

1 - Not enough publicity on conference: 1 teacher

1 - Demonstration on implementing: 1 teacher

1 - Feeling that teachers should be militant: 1 teacher

1 - Connection not made between evaluation and education: 1 teacher

1 - 10:30 demonstration: 1 teacher

1 - Teachers don't admit incompetency: 1 school committeeman

The participants were then asked to describe their major learnings from the workshop.

23 - Content of Denver Plan (and its implementation): 16 teachers, 5 administrators, 1 school board member & 1 teacher-administrator

7 - Confirm feelings on evaluation: 3 teachers, 2 administrators, 1 director & 1 counselor

5 - Education people have concern with the problem: 3 teachers, 1 administrator & 1 "other"

4 - Two-way appraisal: 2 teachers, 1 administrator & 1 school committeeman

4 - Need for cooperation among education people: 3 teachers & 1 director

3 - Blank: 3 administrators

2 - TEPS may becoming militant: 1 counselor & 1 teacher

2 - There is a need for evaluation: 1 administrator & 1 parent

1 - Checklist evaluation inadequacies: 1 board member

1 - Take sense of fear from appraisals by more constructive evaluation: 1 teacher

1 - Encouraged by evaluation method: 1 director

1 - Interest among education people for <u>just</u> appraisal: 1 teacher

1 - Many people are interested in evaluation but negative attitudes are prevalent: 1 teacher

1 - Recognize problems of evaluation: 1 teacher

1 - Change in focus of purpose of evaluation: 1 teacher

1 - Found out feelings of various groups: 1 teacher

1 - Refinement of purpose of education: 1 teacher

1 - Quantity and quality definitions of education in comparison of teachers salary and who's responsible for quantity and quality of education: 1 teacher

1 - Administrators can take time to do things need and want to do: 1 director

1 - I do not know enough about the teaching profession: 1 parent

1 - Money equals better education: 1 teacher

1 - We are on the "right track": 1 administrator

1 - Meaning of TEPS importance: 1 teacher

1 - "Nothing I didn't already know, teachers still want to pass the buck.": 1 school director

1 - Better understand teacher problems: 1 school board administrator

1 - Help should be available to teachers to educate: 1 parent

1 - Stereotyping principals and teachers: 1 administrator

1 - Insights into wheelings and dealings of administrators: 1 teacher

1 - Failure of the plan to make aware need for inservice training for both teachers and administrators: 1 teacher

The next question was, "Why did you come to the workshop?". The responses were as follows:

14 - Concern over evaluation: 8 teachers, 3 administrators, 1 director, 1 school board administrator & 1 board member

11 - To learn about the Denver Plan: 6 teachers, 3 administrators, 1 teacher-administrator & 1 parent

8 - By invitation: 3 teachers, 2 administrators, 1 parent, 1 school committeeman & 1 school board member

8 - Representative of local association: 8 teachers

6 - Interest in better education: 5 teachers, & 1 school director

4 - Interested: 2 teachers, 1 administrator & 1 parent

4 - To learn: 2 teachers, 1 counselor & 1 director

3 - Superintendent's suggestion: 1 director, 1 administrator & 1 board member

2 - Because I'm a teacher: 2 teachers

2 - To learn views of MTA on evaluation: 2 teachers

2 - Asked by local Teachers Association: 1 parent & 1 administrator

2 - On state TEPS Committee: 2 teachers

1 - Am a new chairman - wanted to find out what TEPS is all about. Also, needed to present something on TEPS & local groups: 1 teacher

1 - Asked by the teachers: 1 administrator

1 - "Ignorance - President of association needed a body. I have been enlightened since and favorably.": 1 counselor

1 - Curiosity: 1 teacher

1 - Representative for school district: 1 teacher

1 - Substitute for someone who couldn't come: 1 teacher

1 - To show my interest to the staff of our school and encourage them to become involved: 1 administrator

1 - Requested by local school officials as an interested & active citizen in public affairs: 1 "Other"

1 - To help in planning SEPA meetings: 1 teacher-administrator

Number seven on the evaluation questionnaire was, "What suggestions, if any, would you make for improving this workshop?". Responses:

17 - Divide into smaller groups and use a general session to summarize: 9 teachers, 3 administrators, 2 parents, 2 school directors & 1 counselor

13 - None: 5 teachers, 4 administrators, 1 director, 1 parent, 1 school board member, & 1 "other"

13 - Better facilities (larger room): 4 administrators, 4 teachers, 2 directors, 1 counselor, 1 teacher-administrator & 1 board member

4 - Making more time: 3 teachers & 1 school committeeman

3 - Make available to more people: 2 administrators & 1 teacher

3 - More publicity: 3 teachers

1 - Should be done on a regional basis: 1 administrator

1 - Denver Plan should have been mailed to delegates ahead of time: 1 teacher

1 - Provide more <u>hard data</u> on the plan: 1 teacher

1 - More meetings and possibly Regional School Board Association presentations: 1 director

1 - Make cross section of participants: 1 teacher

1 - Include case-studies to clarify how Plan works: 1 teacher

1 - Separate the urban demonstration and implementations from the rural: 1 teacher

1 - More directors should attend this workshop: 1 school board administrator

1 - More specific demonstrations with specific goals be demonstrated; too much about what should be done and too little about how it can be done: 1 parent

1 - Relate to colleges, teachers from colleges need to teach students to handle evaluation: 1 teacher

1 - I wish the panel discussion (role playing) had had more to do with principal-teacher evaluation: 1 teacher

1 - More realistic representation of administration and their problems connected with our goals: 1 teacher

1 - Perhaps we should have had student participation on the reaction panel: 1 teacher

1 - Better communication: 1 teacher

1 - Establish sample evaluation: 1 teacher

1 - Copies of slides as take-home materials: 1 director

1 - Explain how teachers bring the Denver Plan to the Board, supervisors, principal: 1 teacher

Then the question was asked, "What follow-up would you recommend?"

14 - District or regional meetings: 10 teachers, 2 administrators, 1 director & 1 school committeeman

7 - Smaller groups to study, draft and recommend evaluation materials for local observation: 2 teachers, 2 parents, 2 administrators, & 1 counselor

7 - Survey of schools in Maine using Denver Plan and evaluation of its value in their school: 5 teachers & 2 administrators

6 - Blank: 4 teachers, 1 parent & 1 "other"

3 - Representatives report to local associations and administrators and plan what can be done: 2 teachers & 1 administrator

3 - Send Denver Plan to superintendents to call attention to ways teachers are thinking about evaluation: 3 teachers

2 - Knowledge of any refinement or other pertinent data on the Denver Plan: 1 teacher & 1 administrator

2 - MTA help and advice to local associations in presenting this: 1 teacher & 1 administrator

2 - Newsletter to go to every teacher touching on highlights of <u>entire</u> conference: 1 teacher & 1 board member

2 - Another session: 1 parent & 1 administrator

2 - Have Uniserv representatives meet with local committees and representatives from board to discuss plan and implementation: 2 teachers

1 - More specific work on DPA itself: 1 teacher

1 - Coordinate efforts with a state school board association for mutually approved policy. Local publicity supporting policy of evaluation of teacher performance: 1 director

1 - Presentation of the Plan to the State School Board Association: 1 school board member

1 - Circulate brief case histories of good and poor evaluations, so teacher can relate to the concept before being involved: 1 teacher

1 - Pilot projects: 1 teacher

1 - More evaluation tools: 1 teacher-administrator

1 - Exchange of views: 1 teacher

1 - TEPS needs more publicizing: 1 teacher

1 - Invite only school board chairman and superintendents to a conference much like this and "pay their expenses": 1 administrator

1 - This type of workshop for Superintendents & Directors: 1 school director

1 - Questionnaires to representatives to see what other teachers think of this program when they go back to their school system: 1 administrator

1 - Send personnel to individual communities to give discussion to school boards and school personnel on the Denver Plan: 1 school board administrator

1 - Local workshops to put teachers more at ease about evaluation: 1 administrator

1 - Workshop next fall - "Where have we gone?": 1 counselor

1 - Continued emphasis on the requirements for personnel evaluation/appraisal: 1 director

Finally, when the participants were asked to use one word to describe the workshop, four (4) left this blank --2 teachers, 1 parent, and 1 school board member. The remaining 61 respondants answered in the following manner:

4 - Excellent: 2 teachers, 1 school board member & 1 administrator

4 - Interesting: 3 teachers & 1 school committeeman

3 - Helpful: 2 administrators & 1 teacher

3 - Enlightening: 1 director, 1 administrator & 1 parent

3 - Constructive: 2 teachers & 1 director

3 - Fair: 2 teachers & 1 parent

2 - Beginning: 1 administrator & 1 teacher

2 - Provocative: 2 teachers

2 - Thought-provoking: 1 teacher & 1 board member

2 - Stimulating: 1 teacher & 1 parent

2 - Valuable: 1 teacher & 1 counselor

1 - Full: 1 director

1 - Vital: 1 teacher

1 - Hope: 1 administrator

1 - Self-evaluation: 1 teacher

1 - Great: 1 teacher

1 - Promising: 1 parent

1 - One-sided: 1 teacher

1 - Terrific: 1 teacher

1 - Repetitious: 1 teacher

1 - Off-track: 1 teacher

1 - Inspiring: 1 administrator

1 - Uneven: 1 counselor

1 - Useful: 1 teacher

1 - Confused: 1 school director

1 - Beneficial: 1 administrator

1 - Ideal: 1 teacher

1 - Worthwhile: 1 administrator

4.) Summary of Evaluator

In view of the above information gleaned from the questionnaires and as a result of the evaluator's participation and observations of the "TEPS" Teacher Evaluation Conference, the following summary points and observations are made:

a.) Despite the fact of inadequate facilities --i.e. 24 commented about too little space, poor audio-visual set up, overcrowdedness, size and shape of tables precluded group discussions, etc.-- there was a very high interest level in the theme of the conference (i.e. teacher evaluation).

b.) The evaluator interviewed about ten principals and found unanimity in their support of a teacher evaluation procedure that does not place the responsibility of teacher evaluation on the principal as does the present procedure. All principals interviewed made the same point. Namely, they are not in a position to do a fair teacher evaluation because they cannot spend the time required in observing teacher performance. All supported the need for a new teacher evaluation method that would include elements of self evaluation and a procedure that is agreed upon by the teachers themselves.

c.) Copies of the Denver Plan (the content agenda of the conference) should have been sent to all conferees before the actual conference so that all conferees could familiarize themselves with the plan and have informed discussions on the merits of the Plan and its possible adaptation for use in Maine.

d.) It was not surprizing that the Denver Plan itself was seen as a threat by some conferees, as indeed it was, if for no other reason than the fact that such a plan was designed to replace a teacher tenure system such as the one that now exists in Maine.

e.) It is recommended that the NEPTE staff and Board of Directors read over the Denver Plan (if they are not already familiar with it) simply because it is one carefully thought-out response to the problem of teacher evaluation.

f.) As with the first two workshops evaluated (New Hampshire and Rhode Island) students were conspicuous at the Maine conference only by their absence. Only twice were students even mentioned at the Maine conference. A very young teacher openly expressed concern that no students were involved. So too did a parent who was attending the conference in her capacity as school board member.

g.) The evaluation team here presents another tack for evaluating teacher performance that would fit in with the evaluation philosophy of the Denver Plan, e.g. for high school students.

COURSE EVALUATION

1. What word or words most adequately reflect your feelings about this course?

2. What aspect of the course did you like the most?

3. What aspects of the course did you like the least?

4. Identify your major learnings

5. Would you recommend to a friend that they take this course with this teacher?
   yes ___ no ___
   other _____

6. In your opinion did the teacher know the subject matter of the course?

(Course Evaluation continued)

7. Give your rating of the quality of the presentations made by the teacher

Excellent	___
Good	___
Average	___
Fair to average	___
Poor	___

8. In your opinion how capable was the teacher in encouraging class participation and interaction?

Excellent	___
Good	___
Average	___
Fair	___
Poor	___

---

h.) It is strongly recommended to conference planners of the Maine Teacher Association and to the NEPTE staff and Board of Directors that students be invited to participate in conference planning in the future.

Vermont Workshop Evaluation Report

The evaluation report on the "Change in Education" conference, held at the Sugarbush Inn at Warren, Vermont, on 1 December, 1972, is organized under three categories:

1.) Analysis and Summation of the Questionnaire

2.) Summation of Reports of Participant Evaluators Team

3.) Summary of Evaluator (J. DeWitt)

1.) Analysis and Summation of the Questionnaire

Of the 133 participants at the conference, 42 filled out the questionnaires; this is approximately 32%. The break down of the responding participants is as follows:

Mostly teachers:	Administrators:	Others:
1. Elementary: 14	1. Elementary: 5	1. Parents: 2
2. Secondary: 7	2. Secondary: 4	2. NEPTE: 1
3. K-12	3. K-12: 2	3. State Dept. Ed.: 1
Elementary COP Aide		4. Industry: 1
Secondary Aide		5. Supervisory Union: 1
Team leader, Vt. teacher corps		6. Unidentified: 1
2 Head Start teachers		Total Other = 7
Others = 6		

The remainder of the points on the Evaluation Questionnaire and the comments contributed by the respondants follow:

WHY DID THEY COME?

Teachers:

Elementary:

Wanted to discuss change: 6
Invited by administration: 5
Wanted to exchange ideas: 2
Served on planning committee, felt obligated: 1

Secondary:

To learn: 3
To facilitate change: 2
Saw program: 1
Interested in open classroom: 1

Other:
  New ideas: 4
  Interaction: 1
  Specific classroom techniques: 1

Summary: Most teachers came because they wanted change - 10.

Administration:
  Elementary:
    Change: 2
    Administrative duty: 1
    As a substitute for someone else: 1
    Interested in teacher reeducation: 1

  Secondary:
    Change: 2
    Invited by principal: 1
    Official representative VEA TEPS: 1

Others:
  Represent TEPS: 1
  Keep up with things: 1

Summary: As with teachers, the administrators who came for nonaccidental reasons came because they wanted change (4).

Others

All different reasons: more community involvement, professional interest, to evaluate the conference, interest in open campus, better teacher preparation, and as a substitute for someone else.

ONE WORD TO DESCRIBE THE WORKSHOP

Teachers:

Elementary teachers gave very positive reactions (12) such as Great! Inspiring! Good. There was one blank and one neutral "fragmented".

Secondary teachers answered positively,also, but it was more intellectual than emotional. All 7 responses were positive, but words were "educational", "interesting" and "good".

Other teachers answered with 4 positive responses, 1 neutral response, and 1 blank.

Administrators:

Elementary administrators replied with 3 positive, 1 negative and 1 blank reaction; also, 2 neutral, "ambiguous" and "patronizing".

Both secondary administrators replied positively, as did both K-12 administrators.

Others:

In this category, there were 5 positive responses, 1 blank, and 1 negative response, "frustrating".

WHAT DID YOU LIKE MOST ABOUT THE WORKSHOP?

Teachers:

Elementary:	Share ideas:	4	
	Friendly people:	3	(Two specifically referred to Marion Stroud.)
	Informality and participation:	3	
	Open classrooms:	1	
	Future of education:	2	
	Information gained:	1	
Secondary:	Informality:	2	
	Futuristics:	1	
	Open Class:	1	
	New Ideas:	2	
	Creative use of media:	1	
Other:	Participation:	3	
	Futuristics:	2	
	Speakers:	1	

Summary: Most teachers enjoyed most the informality, friendliness, and participation (11), many were concerned with new ideas and the future of education (10), and 2 people were concerned with open classrooms.

Administrators:

Elementary:	Small discussion groups:	2
	Ideas of change:	2
	Interesting topics:	1
Secondary:	Participation:	1
	Improvisation:	1
	Change:	1
	Interaction with others:	1
Other:	Informality:	1
	Topics:	1

Summary: The administrators, like the teachers, enjoyed discussing change and liked the informality and participation of all.

Other: Interest of participants: 2
Informality, cross-section of educators present, change, improvisation group, and a blank completed the answers for the "others".

WHAT DID YOU LIKE LEAST ABOUT THE WORKSHOP?

Teachers:

Elementary:
- Not enough time: 5
- Blank: 5
- Media workshop: 1
- The First Day: 1
- No foreknowledge because of a bad program: 1
- Jargon: 1

Secondary:
- Blank: 2
- No foreknowledge: 1
- Afternoon discussion: 1
- Not enough depth: 1
- Not enough time: 1
- Not enough secondary teachers: 1

Other:
- Not enough time: 2
- Weather and distance: 2
- Assessing Change: 1
- Monopoly of discussions by a few (superintendents): 1

Summary: Most felt the lack of time (8), two people felt the need for a more complete program, and the others found their dissatisfaction with individual sessions.

Administrators:

Elementary: Lack of time, the session conducted by the consultant, not enough involvement, afternoon session, and discussion of concepts that do not allow for the individuality of the teacher.

Secondary:
- Lack of time: 3
- Misuse of available time: 1

Other:
- Lack of time: 1
- Blank: 1

Others:
- Lack of time: 2
- Weather: 1
- Cooperative discussion: 1
- Lack of directness in dealing with others: 1
- Not enough activity: 1
- Particular (but unspecified) workshop: 1

WHAT WERE YOUR MAJOR LEARNINGS?

Teachers:		
Elementary:	Change:	6
	Openness:	3
	Exchange of ideas:	2
	Learning by doing:	1
	Media use:	1
	Blank:	1
Secondary:	Creative use of media, improvisation: 3	
	Practical ideas, innovative ideas, openness, common ideas	
Other:	Futuristics:	2
	Blank:	2
	Community Affairs Classroom technique, openness.	
Administrators:		
Elementary:	Change:	2
	Openness:	2
	Need for evaluation programs: 1	
Secondary:	Nothing:	1
	Change:	1
	Failure is taught:	1
	Reinforcement of present knowledge: 1	
Other:	Trend to better education: 1	
	Media:	1
Others:	Change:	3
	Techniques for use of drama in groups, variety of combinations of concepts, students are the real power, administrators know little about the Vermont system.	

WHAT ARE YOUR SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING THE WORKSHOP?

Teachers:

Elementary: More time: 5
Blank: 5
More often, list from all participants of one new idea they will implement immediately, greater availability of workshops to more teachers, fewer questions.

Secondary: More time: 2
More depth, separate elementary and secondary, more communication with innovative people, better attendance, and more often, and one blank.

Other: Describe workshop content in the program: 3
More time: 2
Blank: 1

Administrators:

Elementary: More time: 3
Involve more people: 1
Present both sides of an issue: 1

Secondary: More time: 2
Better agenda: 1
Involve participants more: 1

Other: More often: 1
More depth: 1

Others: Smaller groups, more time for talk, more time, place emphasis on follow-up of change, group encounters, bibliography on ideas presented, and one blank.

WHAT FOLLOW-UP WOULD YOU RECOMMEND?

Teachers:

Elementary:
- More, and more often: 7
- More information of teaching change: 1
- Discussion with colleagues in own school: 1
- Small group discussions of practical application of ideas: 1
- More openness in own classrooms: 1
- Blank: 1

Secondary:
- More, and more often: 3
- Individual application of new methods followed by a report to the participants of results: 1
- Get the community more involved in secondary ed.: 1
- Blank: 1

Other:
- Blank: 3
- Summarize for those who couldn't attend: 1
- Evaluation for participants: 1
- Bigger involvement: 1

Administrators:

Elementary:
- Blank: 3
- More, more often: 2

Secondary:
- More, more often: 1
- Follow-up questionnaire: 1
- Conference representative reach <u>all</u> teachers

Other:
- Blank: 2

<u>Others</u>:
- Follow-up evaluation: 4
- Blank: 2
- Educational Resource Center in each district: 1

Summary: Teachers, administrators and "others" all recommended overwhelmingly having more similar workshops more frequently(9). Also recommended were follow-up reports and evaluations of various types.

2.) Summation of Reports of Participant Evaluators Team

Due to last minute inclement weather and mechanical difficulties with their automobile, four of the five members of the participant-evaluation team (all five were volunteers from the pre registered conferees) arrived on time for the conference but too late for the pre conference briefing session scheduled at 8:15 a.m. at the Sugarbush Inn. The four who did not make the briefing session had all travelled in the same car. The participant-evaluation team was thus reduced to three persons, one volunteer and the two professional evaluators. The three evaluators decided to do in-depth interviews of a small number of conferees rather than try to get the informal impressions and judgments of the majority.

All three participant evaluators (including the native Vermonter) noted that in the early planning stages, initiative was shared and the fact of broad based collaborative planning very effectively invisibilized the mechanical aspects of conference implementation. Because volunteers from the conferees were so cooperative and assumed part ownership of the conference from the initial planning stages on, the whole conference was extraordinarily well organized from the important factor of virtually complete pre registration (about 95%) and content mailouts to all conferees before the actual conference event.

Not only did a number of the conferees concern themselves with the mechanical aspects of the conference in the planning stages, but others contributed heavily to the intellectual work of very carefully shaping the conference theme and content. Moreover, all resource persons agreed to offer their time and services free of charge.

Furthermore, the beautiful conference setting of the Sugarbush Inn and the obvious fact of a generous budget, the meals, well-prepared, and

the thoughtful competence and caring friendliness of Bob Law, the Sugarbush Innkeeper, contributed heavily to creating a very relaxed and friendly atmosphere that in no way hindered the work of the conference itself.

Because the bulk of the day was given to concurrent offerings, it was impossible for anyone conferee or evaluator to get involved in all the workshop sessions. This fact underlined the inadequacy of the questionnaire that was designed and distributed by the evaluation team. For example, none of the last eight questions of the questionnaire distinguish sufficiently between the individual concurrent offerings or work sessions and the total workshop experience. As a result the filled out questionnaires give evaluative comments and individual judgments that seem intended to extend to the entire workshop whereas they actually spring from individual observations about one or several of the concurrent sessions and not from involvement in all the concurrent sessions and offerings.

All three members of the evaluation team observed the ambivalence with which many individual conferees approached the initial multi-media total environment construction from 9:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. in the lower conference room of the Inn. As Allen Cohen aptly observed, those who approached the multi-media experience alone tended either to withdraw from the room rather quickly after entering without getting involved or mingling with others, whereas those who approached the multi-media experience in groups tended to stay and intensify and expand their initial interaction.

The in-depth interviews can be summarized as follows:

- There is a resentment residue in evidence against Harvey Scribner that is shared by a number of people who were involved in Vermont schooling institutions before Scribner came as Education Commissioner and who are still involved after his departure for New York. As one conferee put it quite bluntly, "I resent the implication that all that existed before Scribner arrived on the scene wasn't really worth very much. And secondly, I didn't appreciate the fact that we all did the work and he got all the credit for whatever changes many of us worked very hard to effect."

- Another negative comment was made by a group of three conferees who are teachers. They resented the financial outlay for the Sugarbush conference when they needed money for things that would help them be more effective teachers (e.g. visual aids).

- Three conferees interviewed separately were enormously impressed with the Jerry Glenn-Cindy Guy presentation on "Futuristics in Education," while two administrators were "turned off" by Dan Heisey's "Assessing Change Programs." This evaluator felt that in fact Heisey's presentation was perhaps too sophisticated and threatening for the conferees with which he was dealing.

- All participants interviewed who were involved in the "Responsive Environments" presentation came from the small group led by Anne Schumer. Each of five participants commented separately on Miss Schumer's need to develop skills in working with groups if she is to be effective as an educational consultant.

- Three participants interviewed who were coming away from Marian Stroud's afternoon presentation "Are you more or less open than your classroom?" commented that the group was too big for a good discussion

to develop and that there is need for clarification around the concepts closed - open.

- Stephanie Cleverdan and Robert Fisher's "Education is Everybody's Business" session tended to polarize participants. Those who seemed upset with the presentation of steps toward authentic involvement of the broader community in the policy formulation of the school and in the process of educating its children were the administrators who attended the session. And anyone who has thought through or experienced the kinds of conflicting demands made on school administrators by diverse constituencies can well understand why these steps could be quite upsetting and threatening.

3.) Evaluator's Summary and Recommendations

The evaluators (J. DeWitt and S. Langton) concur with all of the observations made above (under #2) and repeat in this summary the successful effects of shared initiative and broad based collaborative planning on the part of the NEPTE staff and conferees in both content and mechanics of the Sugarbush event. Furthermore, we attribute the good spirit and high degree of participant involvement in the event almost entirely to the way the planning process was conceptualized and implemented. We did observe that, unlike the earlier workshops (New Hampshire, Rhode Island and Maine), the Vermont conferees were very punctual in arriving at Sugarbush (despite bad weather) and in adhering to the conference structure.

We note both the internal and external aspects of the collaborative planning that went into the Sugarbush event that set it above the three earlier workshops in the series -- Internal: Two NEPTE staff persons (Jacobs and DeWitt) worked together on the conceptualizing and mechanics,

whereas in the earlier conferences only one NEPTE staff person (DeWitt) was totally involved. External: Jo Lynn Banner (an Antioch-Putney graduate student), more than any other participant, provided collaboration and caring both in the conceptualizing and attendance to mechanical details of planning and implementation that made an enormous difference and contributed heavily to the success of the event.

Finally, the closing session of the Sugarbush event, although it did not go according to plan, went extraordinarily well. The original plan was to have a formal panel on "Preparing Teachers for Change". Allen Cohen, one of the four prospective panelists solicited the assent of the plenary assembly to change the format from panel to a spectrum of small groups ranging themselves on a conservative-liberal spectrum with regard to educational change. It was interesting to note that the para professionals and other low status people clustered toward the liberal end of the continuum whereas extreme conservative end of the continuum was populated by administrators only, excepting one professional evaluator and two black resource persons.

Massachusetts Workshop Evaluation Report

The evaluation report on the Western Massachusetts conference held at the Highpoint Motor Inn in Chicopee, Massachusetts, on December 8, 1971, is organized under three categories:

1.) Analysis and Summation of the Questionnaire

2.) Summation of Reports of Participant Evaluators Team

3.) Summary of Evaluator (J. DeWitt)

1.) Analysis and Summation of the Questionnaire

Of the 48 conferees who returned the evaluation questionnaire, there were:

9 Secondary school teachers

9 Elementary school teachers

8 Elementary school administrators

4 Secondary school administrators

3 Middle School administrators

2 Elementary-secondary school administrators

1 SASSI student

1 Administrator (no institution checked)

1 Elementary school teacher-administrator

1 College student and teacher

1 Teacher-administrator (no institution checked)

1 Middle school teacher

1 Secondary school student

1 College teacher

1 College administrator

1 College critic teacher - K

1 College (Board of Education) administrator

The remainder of the points on the Evaluation Questionnaire and the comments contributed by the respondants follow:

WHAT DID YOU LIKE MOST ABOUT THIS WORKSHOP?

11 - Small enough for interaction: 5 administrators, 4 teachers, 1 teacher-administrator & 1 critic teacher

8 - Variety, relevance and quality of structured offerings: 4 teachers & 4 administrators

7 - The people and their frank exchange of ideas: 3 teachers, 2 administrators, 1 teacher-administrator & 1 student & teacher

4 - "Futuristics": 2 administrators & 2 teachers

4 - Informal structure: 3 administrators & 1 student & teacher

2 - Workshop on Principal/Teacher Relationships: 2 administrators

2 - Education for Self Determination: 1 administrator & 1 teacher

2 - The H.S. students who commented freely about their problems: 1 teacher & 1 administrator

2 - Integrated Day: 2 teachers

2 - The lunch (good chance for conversation): 1 administrator & 1 teacher-administrator

1 - Freedom to discuss education and courteous service: 1 student

1 - The correct billing of "workshop", not lecture: 1 administrator

1 - Slides and discussion on concept of Open Door: 1 administrator

1 - "Everybody is a Star": 1 teacher

1 - The First Day: 1 teacher

1 - Improvisations and Theatre games: 1 teacher

1 - Practical experience: 1 administrator

1 - Practical experience: 1 administrator

1 - Panel discussion: 1 administrator

1 - Drama - we actually got "inside" the experience: 1 teacher

1 - Blank: 1 administrator

1 - It was free: 1 teacher

1 - Setting: 1 administrator

1 - The pamphlet: 1 teacher

1 - The opportunity to discover what I really believe about learning: 1 teacher

1 - Bilingual child, Judy Kennedy: 1 administrator

1 - SASSI preparation: 1 administrator

1 - It happened: 1 administrator

1 - Learning about new aspects of Education: 1 teacher

WHAT DID YOU LIKE LEAST ABOUT THIS WORKSHOP?

7 - No comment: 2 teachers, 2 administrators, 1 student, 1 teacher-administrator & 1 critic teacher

5 - Too little time: 3 teachers, 1 student & teacher, & 1 administrator

3 - Sessions manned by incompetents: 2 administrators & 1 teacher

2 - Lunch: 1 teacher & 1 administrator

2 - Waiting for a speaker for a meeting that we didn't have: 2 administrators

2 - Bilingual Child: 1 teacher & 1 administrator

1 - The 9 to 10 session was too long: 1 administrator

1 - Panel was left too unresolved: 1 administrator

1 - Integrated Day movie was too long: 1 administrator

1 - Needed another session to provide ideas for application of the concrete ideas presented: 1 teacher

1 - Unsophisticated resource persons: 1 administrator

1 - The multimedia presentation had no substance; no meaning to it: 1 teacher

1 - "Inexperienced, gramatically-perfect, but ignorant (of traditional efforts!) teachers": 1 teacher

1 - Film on "First Day" (I'd seen before): 1 administrator

1 - Black vs. White; suburb vs. urban: 1 administrator

1 - Seemed to deteriorate into an exposition of expenses rather than a discussion of ideas: 1 administrator

1 - More specifics about the open concept: 1 teacher

1 - Subject areas were disappointing - not relevant to my situation: 1 administrator

1 - Couldn't visit all sessions: 1 administrator

1 - Not enough course description: 1 teacher

1 - Self determination: 1 administrator

1 - "The threat that these discoveries present to my old values and performance": 1 teacher

1 - Original session description was misleading: 1 administrator

1 - I met and heard from more administrators than teachers: 1 teacher

1 - Show clearer definitions in offerings between secondary and elementary: 1 student

1 - A feeling that racism was a controlling factor: 1 administrator

1 - The theatre game workshop was ended with many unanswered questions: a student & teacher

1 - Little things like directions to different rooms: 1 teacher

1 - The first period was immature and it dragged: 1 teacher-administrator

1 - Assessing change programs: 1 teacher

1 - The smoking: 1 teacher

1 - It didn't allow for the group participation possible: 1 administrator

1 - More awareness made known to resource people as to size of group: 1 teacher

1 - Lack of overall cohesiveness ("Why not deal, more in depth, with one area of change"): 1 teacher

1 - The defensiveness of the audience about the public schools and some of the assumptions about education and SASSI implied in the questions: 1 teacher

1 -"I was invited": 1 administrator

PLEASE BRIEFLY DESCRIBE YOUR MAJOR LEARNINGS FORM THE WORKSHOP

8 - An interest and desire for need to change: 4 teachers, 2 administrators, 1 teacher-administrator & 1 student

6 - New ideas on alternatives in classroom: 3 teachers, and 3 administrators

5 - The evidence of concern about problems in education today: 4 administrators & 1 teacher

5 - Open school concept: 4 administrators & 1 teacher

4 - Basic operation of integrated program: 3 teachers & 1 administrator

4 - Evaluation techniques and the new guide lines to judge education by: 4 administrators

3 - Reinforcement of earlier held beliefs: 2 administrators & 1 teacher

2 - Little structure is needed to produce a valuable learning experience: 2 teachers

2 - Blank: 2 administrators

1 - To educate the "whole" child there are many varied approaches: 1 teacher

1 - Progression of a child should be at an individual's pace to be successful: 1 administrator

1 - That individual human potential is so precious that we have to test our true values in working on the personal, political & economic obstacles to self-determination: 1 teacher

1 - Ideas gained form improv. & theatre games: 1 teacher

1 - The rapport and awareness of group situations through the drama and affective workshops: 1 teacher-administrator

1 - Provided tools for greater understanding of individual profiles in group experience: 1 teacher

1 - Using body for dramatic interpretation: 1 critic teacher

1 - Perception through intensive learning using senses more effectively: 1 teacher

1 - It still gets down to the basics of the relationships between one individual and another: 1 administrator

1 - Students are aware of school shortcomings and react positively to an opportunity to meet their needs: 1 teacher

1 - Problems must be solved collectively: 1 student

1 - I learned a little more about people: 1 administrator

1 - Extent of community involvement that blacks wish to have: 1 administrator

1 - Open my doors to the students and creating a learning atmosphere; without being the director: 1 student & teacher

1 - A whole new view of self-determination and community influence on the schools: 1 teacher

1 - Teacher's attitudes and values toward education, i.e., humanizing and relevant curriculum: 1 teacher

1 - Educators are more hung up on standards and academic performance than I ever before realized: 1 teacher

1 - Philosophy may be more important than content: 1 teacher

1 - Importance of maintaining cultural background of the bilingual child: 1 administrator

1 - Learned of a film and a speaker to get to come to my school: 1 teacher

1 - A creative environment can blow your mind: 1 teacher

1 - That elementary education is making the mistake of getting too big: 1 administrator

WHY DID YOU COME TO THE WORKSHOP?

14 - To learn new ideas: 6 administrators, 5 teachers, 1 student & teacher, 1 student & 1 critic teacher

6 - Asked by supervisor to be representative: 5 administrators & 1 teacher

4 - The program looked good: 3 administrators & 1 teacher

4 - Concern for change and improving the education structure: 2 administrators, and 1 student & teacher (1)

3 - Blank: 3 teachers

3 - I was invited to take part in the program: 3 administrators

2 - Because I wanted to meet NEPTE and see what it had to offer: 1 teacher & 1 teacher-administrator

2 - Professional improvement: 2 teachers

1 - I thought I would enjoy the improvisation group--thought it would be similar to a sensitivity group: 1 teacher

1 - To improve my skill in changing teacher attitudes: 1 teacher

1 - Open plan beginning: 1 administrator

1 - Need for new programs in middle school: 1 teacher

1 - As a supervisor to keep informed about high school curricula: 1 teacher

1 - Workshop B was cancelled: 1 teacher

1 - To share: 1 administrator

1 - To meet new people: 1 teacher

1 - To better understand the skills necessary to develop affective education: 1 teacher

1 - Because of relationship with the U. of Mass. and NEPTE: 1 administrator

1 - I wanted to: 1 teacher

1 - Administration brought it to my attention: 1 teacher

WHAT SUGGESTIONS WOULD YOU MAKE FOR IMPROVING THIS WORKSHOP?

11 - None: 5 teachers, 4 administrators, 1 student & 1 critic teacher

4 - Provide a wider selection of programs: 2 teachers & 2 administrators

3 - A chance to go to all sessions; couldn't when they were held at the same time: 2 administrators & 1 teacher-administrator

3 - More time: 1 teacher, 1 student & teacher and 1 administrator

2 - Less films and/or smaller groups, more discussion: 2 administrators

2 - On program sheet, specify grade levels: 1 administrator & 1 student

1 - More comprehensive session description: 1 administrator

1 - Greater expertise: 1 administrator

1 - Screen the personnel a little more carefully: 1 administrator

1 - Better identification of participants: 1 teacher

1 - Have more classroom teachers present: 1 teacher

1 - Try to represent all levels of students: 1 teacher

1 - Earlier beginning: 1 administrator

1 - Move faster in beginning: 1 teacher-administrator

1 - More teaching tools for instructions: 1 teacher

1 - Give it a focus so that it will spill over back home: 1 teacher

1 - More than one level of work should be designed into each of its sessions to enforce the experience: 1 administrator

1 - "I don't have any but maybe others would feel that the creativity & participation required should have been given prior notice": 1 teacher

1 - Have group trainer present to identify for the audience some of the assumptions he hears in audience questions: 1 teacher

1 - Deal, more in depth, with <u>one</u> area of change: 1 teacher

1 - Being involved with one group for a longer time period: 1 teacher

1 - Have a better bilingual program since this is an essential element in inner city education: 1 teacher

1 - End with summation and concensus of opinion: 1 administrator

1 - Pro and con shoud be represented on panel: 1 administrator

1 - Get away from the ideal situation and help solve basic problems: 1 administrator

1 - Insure that students do more talking than audience: 1 teacher

1 - I would like to hear from others (Vt.) instead of all Amherst: 1 administrator

1 - Shorten workshops offered so that more could be taken in during course of day: 1 teacher

1 - Some additional free time between discussion groups to explore questions with various individuals: 1 teacher

1 - Make afternoon session optional; stay with same group or change: 1 teacher

1 - More middle school approaches or programs: 1 administrator

1 - Advise resource persons not to apologize in the beginning but rather accept the fact that they were selected for a perfectly good reason: 1 administrator

WHAT FOLLOW-UP WOULD YOU RECOMMENT?

13 - None: 7 administrators, 5 teachers & 1 teacher-administrator

12 - More of these: 8 teachers, 2 administrators, 1 student and 1 student & teacher

6 - Summary statements to provide total overview & Newsletters: 3 administrators, 2 teachers & 1 teacher-administrator

5 - Information where to observe this type of education: 4 administrators & 1 teacher

2 - Make speakers available to visit various schools on request: 1 student & 1 teacher

2 - Panels and group discussions: 1 teacher & 1 administrator

2 - Appropriate materials on certain aspects of programs: 2 teachers

1 - A full-day workshop: 1 teacher

1 - Suggested methods for effecting change: 1 administrator

1 - A future session to discuss the evaluation: 1 administrator

1 - "Same type of organization -- great. It's ultimate reason for being -- admirable": 1 teacher

1 - Questionnaire concerning application of what we learned to all who attended: 1 administrator

1 - "Sessions I was in tended to be terminal - wrapped up at the end. Good exchange but action is too remote": 1 administrator

1 - A workshop on nothing else but to develop the selling of better interpersonal relations: 1 administrator

1 - "I'd like to delve further into this field": 1 critic teacher

PLEASE USE ONE WORD TO DESCRIBE THIS WORKSHOP

8 - Good: 5 administrators & 3 teachers

4 - Excellent: 3 administrators & 1 teacher

3 - Informative: 3 teachers

3 - Great: 1 student, 1 administrator & 1 critic teacher

2 - Thought-provoking: 1 administrator & 1 teacher

2 - Powerful: 2 teachers

2 - Worthwhile: 2 adminstrators

2 - Interesting: 1 teacher & 1 student

2 - Stimulating: 1 student & teacher and 1 teacher

1 - Plus: 1 teacher

1 - Relevant: 1 teacher

1 - Uplifting: 1 teacher

1 - Human: 1 administrator

1 - Blank: 1 administrator

1 - Fair: 1 administrator

1 - Rewarding: 1 teacher

1 - Good attempt but too general: 1 administrator

1 - Versatile: 1 administrator

1 - Disjointed: 1 teacher

1 - Terrific: 1 teacher-administrator

1 - Enlightening: 1 teacher-administrator

1 - Interaction: 1 administrator

1 - Profitable: 1 teacher

1 - O.K.: 1 administrator

1 - Satisfactory: 1 administrator

1 - Instructive: 1 administrator

1 - "Right-on baby keep growing and involve more teachers": 1 administrator

1 - Interesting learning experience: 1 teacher

1 - Client-centered: 1 teacher

2.) Participant-Evaluator's Reports

In that each one of the five volunteer participant evaluators attended differently concurrently running sessions, we present the individual reports themselves.

a.) Josephine L. Cecco, volunteer participant evaluator, reporting on Noel MacKenzie's "Integrated Day" presentation:

Mrs. MacKenzie presented an informal and informative personal experience with the integrated day program funded by the federal government. It was a very interesting presentation beginning with introductory questions about the integrated day, the running commentary with slides and a final period of questions.

She planted the seed for change in the elementary school through her enthusiasm for this creative learning situation and her concrete information (her slides of her class) which was evidence of its success with children, teacher, and her two aides.

That it was enjoyed by the group was demonstrated by everyone in the group remaining after the hour for further questioning and information.

The only negative reaction was that more time was needed for interaction since the speaker was superior. Her personality and her topic sustained the interest of the group.

b.) Mattie S. Edwards, volunteer participant evaluator, reporting on Donald Summer's Community-Based Teacher Training presentation:

Generally -- Very well conducted with good participation.

Group leader well informed on the subject; handled the various viewpoints quite effectively; open-minded, yet with convictions to which he was capable of substantiating. Major point -- The concept is taking hold and is generally being accepted and effective.

Tone of the group was reasonably encouraging in so far as the total idea of community-based teacher training is concerned.

c.) Paul La Flamme, volunteer participant evaluator, reporting on William Smith and the SASSI prep student's presentation of "Everybody is a Star":

Good three-way interaction (student panelists, moderator, audience). Good give and take dialogue. Some pretty good questions asked and issues touched on. Excellent; this group should speak to many conferences. Moderator had excellent insights and remarks on teachers' unions and their roles.

d.) An anonymous participant evaluator reporting on Donald Coverdale's "Affective Education" presentation:

The composition of the group caused Mr. Coverdale to mention that copies of his inservice program for teachers in human relations could be obtained upon request and to ask for group discussion on what they expected and how affective education can be made a vital part of the school philosophy.

There seemed to evolve that the concept of affective education can develop only in an atmosphere of trust which must be established by the administration. The setting for affective education also must be

provided by the administration through differential staffing, team teaching, community resources. This must be accomplished by teachers and administrators working together and setting goals.

The awareness of individuals as individuals is all important. Communication with each other is the key to affective education.

e.) Paul La Flamme again, reporting on Donald Coverdale's presentation:

Relevant; hit on some good issues. Interesting discussion between speaker and audience. Overall - good job.

Speaker - Didn't come until 10 minutes late; a few people left before things began.

- A bit too much lecturing. Audience found it a bit difficult to get a word in edgewise at times. At the end, this cleared up and was no longer a problem.

f.) An anonymous evaluator's remarks about Dieter Paulus' "Assessing Change" presentation:

Paulus gave a straight lecture to sitting participants. There was very little interaction. This observer was turned off not by the subject matter (which was good) but by the manner of presentation. Yet, three other participants, when asked after the presentation, all remarked favorably. One said she learned what she had hoped to learn.

g.) Dick Harris and John DeWitt reporting on the closing session:

- There were 53 in attendance.
- The "fishbowl" design of rotating inner circle participants was an excellent closure design. It was by far the best closure of all five of the workshops.
- The rotating panel broke down the separation of "expert" and "audience" -- all were participants who felt free to move in and

out of the inner circle whenever they wanted to say something. This worked out much better than a panel discussion or a question and answer period.

- The discussion was very real, sometimes quite heated, with about 20 participants taking their turn in the inner circle
- Roland Goddu, the NEPTE Director, did an excellent job of bringing the loose ends together, summarizing and concluding the session. The fact that it was spontaneous was even more appropriate for the moments and the mood.

h.) What follows are three edited interviews of participants:

Interview #1

Elementary Teacher: Vermont

-- Conference not as "traditional" as she expected

-- She felt she got "some ideas" out of the Improvization and Open Campus workshops

-- "I feel too old to really change, but I like conferences like this because they show me things that are going."

-- She felt most comfortable with the lecture sessions.

Interview #2

Principal - Maine Elementary School Principal

-- Feels out of it in Lewsiton, Maine, and likes to "plug" himself back into what new is happening in education in N.E.

-- Thought the overall Conferences was "very good" and "it's too bad we couldn't go to all of the workshops."

Interview #3

Member of Advisory Committee for teacher education funds in Conn.

-- came to see how other states spend their money on teacher education

(Interview #3 continued)

-- he said he didn't really participate in any of the workshops just kind of "dropped in" on all the sessions.

3.) Evaluator's Summary

+ Although the setting of the Springfield conference was a somewhat poorly kept and not very clean motel, the conference was generally quite successful. This is even more remarkable because the planning was done almost entirely by NEPTE staff personnel because the local Springfield sponsors seemed for some reason quite reluctant to assume ownership or responsibility for planning or implementation.

+ It is evident from the Sugarbush and Springfield closures that the NEPTE staff have learned a great deal about closure dynamics and how to structure a very successful final session. Furthermore, there seemed to be a new grace and ease brought to the whole task of conference implementation that was not present in the earlier conferences.

+ There is little question that the threat and promise of change in education is a theme that NEPTE should prusue in its future dissemination strategies. All five conferences of this series focussed on one or another variant of the need for educational change.

+ This evaluator is a bit concerned that even at the fifth workshop of the series students are still so little in evidence in the planning and implementation.

II. COMMON THEMES OF CONCERN

It was once remarked that "People do research for two reasons: first, because it is interesting, and second, because it may be useful."[1] Of particular interest to the evaluation team have been the fundamental underlying themes of concern and interest to conference participants - what Paulo Friere has called "generation themes." What we have attempted to identify are those issues which are most essential to the consciousness of the educational subculture represented by conference participants. The utility of such an effort, particularly for the New England Program in Teacher Education, is clarification of the most fundamental type of question and needs of those they would serve.

In order to gather insight regarding these themes, three methods were utilized. First, at each conference a team of participants were assembled and instructed to observe all activities. The participant team talked informally with other participants and recorded the most prominent concerns and interests of participants. Second, at the conclusion of all sessions, participants were interviewed on a random basis, and these interviews were tape recorded. Third, recognizing that "the observer of a social scene has to enter into and become a part of what he is doing";[2] the evaluator attended conference activities as any other participant and informally interview participants. The data reported

1. Max Millikan. "Inquiry and Policy: The Relation of Knowledge to Action." The Human Meaning of the Social Sciences. Meridian Books. New York. 1963. p. 158.
2. John Madge. The Tools of Social Science. Anchor Books. New York. 1965. p. 330.

below are the result of an analysis of the notes of the participant evaluation team, taped interviews of each conference, and notes of the evaluators.

Freedom

Although it is more than two decades since Arthur Jersild conducted his study of teacher attitudes, it is of interest to note that the issue of freedom continues to be a major concern of teachers as reflected by the teachers and administrators who attended the conferences. Participants indicated an intense interest both in their own sense of freedom as educators, as well as the range and quality of freedom of students. In one respect their concern with freedom was not unlike the wider cultural norm once observed by DeToqueville. Yet, in another sense, there was a unique contemporary focus to their concern for freedom in the schools. Many participants appeared very aware of and affected by what Peter Schrag once referred to as the "Neo-Romantic" critics of education of the 1960's. Frequently, references were made to such educational critics as Goodman, Friedenberg, Kohl, Rogers, and Silberman and Illich. And increasingly at each conference it became evident that the recent literature of educational protest had made its mark upon the practicing educator.

There is an interesting dichotomy of this preoccupation with freedom in education among participants. The clearest focus of the notion of freedom was on "freedom from" educational policies and practices that were felt to restrain the growth and development of the student (and in many cases, the teacher). However, the notion of "freedom for," reflecting the goal of freedom, was seldom stated as clearly. The terms "Open Classroom" and "Humanistic Education" were frequently utilized, and seemed to symbolize the ends of freedom. But the descriptive content and

meaning of these terms were seldom made clear. Nonetheless, there was an intense interest reflected by most participants in concrete organizational structures and activities that would "humanize" or increase the "openness" of the classroom.

Change

A second significant theme expressed by participants concerned the problems associated with educational change. Conference participants, for the most part, were persons predisposed to educational change. However, there was a widespread awareness of the difficulties and restraints in attempting to change the policies and practices of schools. As will be discussed below, participants were highly aware of and concerned about community resistance to educational change. However, there was also considerable expression of concern about resistance and fear among administrators and teachers.

Many participants expressed satisfaction and appreciation in finding that they were not alone in experiencing difficulty in initiating and implementing changes in their schools. It was also observed that those who described successful efforts to innovate were almost invariably quizzed in great detail by other participants who were most interested in learning about the strategies that were used to bring about change. This was reflective of a deep and continued need of participants to develop skills and knowledge in planning and implementing change in school.

When considering possible strategies for change, there are at least three general alternatives.[3] First are rational and empirical strategies

3. Kenneth Benne and Robert Chin. "Strategies for Effecting Change" Research and Technical Notes. Boston University Human Relations Center. Boston, Massachusetts.

which assume that persons make rational choices on the basis of data provided to them; and, therefore, one changes a system by providing appropriate information. Second, normative-reeducatives assume that change comes about when persons are exposed to an experience which causes them to reassess their own values and attitudes. Third, power-coercive strategies assume that persons are basically self interested, and change occurs only when sufficient pressure and force is applied to make a system comply with those who are seeking change in order to protect the system's self interest.

Although educators have historically utilized rational-empirical strategies and in the past decade power-coercive strategies have become most common among teachers associations, the predominant preference of conference participants concerned normative-reeducative strategies. In particular, there was a recognition that change required a great deal of planning, effort, and time for persons to examine their own feelings and attitudes. The need for both community development and planning efforts and improvements in teacher training were often identified as major concerns. Above all, however, there was evidence of a need for knowledge and skills in how to effectively implement strategies for change.

Role

The theme of change was often associated with another frequently expressed concern - new roles for teachers and administrators. The practical consequences of changing the organization and environment of the classroom are very real for the teacher. It suggests a radical reorientation of attitude and understanding in many cases, and demands the acquisition of new knowledge and skills.

In discussions of educational change and changed roles for teachers, concern was frequently expressed about three types of teachers and administrators. The first type of educator, including the majority of participants, included persons predisposed to developing new roles, but in need of specific information, materials, and training. The second group consisted of teachers and administrators who might be interested and willing to change if others could demonstrate new roles and forms of organization, and if support was provided by administrators and the community. The prevailing attitude was that the vast majority of teachers fell into this category. The third group consisted of those who were actively opposed to and resistent to change.

Even a decade ago, the greatest concern among educational innovators was with administrators and teachers who were frozen into their traditional roles and were resistant to any effort to change. Significantly, there was little concern specified about such persons. There seemed to be an assumption present that the educational environment had been altered dramatically in the past decade and the force of social change has placed inevitable demands upon teachers to avoid rigid resistance in order to survive. A surplus of teachers, improved security and benefit, increased status, and a heightened awareness of the rights of students seemed to be assumed as basic "given" of the present educational climate. Therefore, the attitude was often expressed that there was a readiness among the vast majority of teachers to change, to grow, to innovate, and to alter their roles. However, change will not occur among this majority of teachers without legitimization and support from those in positions of authority and power (e.g., administrators, and, above all, school committees). Yet change will not occur in positions of power until there are changes in

attitudes among the community. That is the initial ingredient of the cycle of change. Conference participants were clearly aware of this, and that was the major reason that they expressed an unusually high degree of interest in the issue of community.

Community

"The essence of change lies in the consciousness of the community." This remark was not made by Hegel, Toennies, or Weber, but by one of the conference participants. It does reflect a frequently expressed attitude that to change education and the role of the teacher it will be necessary in each community to take the case to the people. Change cannot be imposed from Washington, a State Capitol, or a state Board of Education. Community attitudes and values, particularly symbolized in School Boards and Committees, are the most fundamental restraining or facilitating forces toward change. This seemed to be clearly understood by most participants and, for that reason, one of the most spirited and popular topics at all conferences was how to generate and obtain support and understanding from the community in order to implement educational change. Again, there was a keen interest among participants in obtaining specific knowledge and skills in terms of how to work more effectively with the community.

Inherent in many of the discussions of community support and opposition was an assumption, explicated in several cases, that the role of the schools and the scope of education within a community should change. In order for change to take place in schools, it was often suggested that a program of continuing education would be necessary among the adult population. Further, the relation between school and community must be strengthened. How to institute such an approach was usually unresolved in discussions.

The issue of community, along with concern regarding freedom, the new role of the teacher, and a desire for change, reflected a sense of awareness of the dominating forces of educational bureaucratization. Participants were aware of the nature and extent of the various forms of institutional restraints upon themselves and their students. Further, if those who attended the conference are in any way representative of the community of educators in New England, and we believe that they are, then it can be assumed that teachers and administrators are aware of those forces that inhibit and restrain educational growth and innovation. What does not appear as clear is how to achieve liberation from the restraining forms and forces that so many educators seek to avoid. Thus teachers, administrators, and students reflect awareness of the sources of their domination, but do not possess the same degree of awareness of the sources and methods of liberation. On the basis of the NEPTE conferences, it is suggested that this need for the tools of liberation is felt and understood and remains as a necessary condition to meet in the future.

III. IMPLICATIONS FOR NEPTE

In recognition of the preceding summary and analysis, it is the opinion of the evaluative team that there are several philosophical and programmatic implications of the conferences and the evaluation for NEPTE.

First, there appears to be a significant concern about the restraining, dominating, and dehumanizing policies and practices in education among the participants. Very few educators apparently need to be convinced of the more dramatic and obvious inequities and shortcomings of schools, and this may reflect an important shift in the consciousness of teachers and administrators in the last decade. Therefore, the present need of educators is not to receive increased critiques of schooling, but to become aware of and to develop alternative policies and practices. The implication for NEPTE is to continue its efforts to encourage, support, and demonstrate programs and activities that model meaningful alternatives to the educational community of New England.

Second, there is a somewhat misleading and seductive feature in the apparent readiness and willingness of many educators to change. Albeit many of the conference participants, and many others who were not in attendance, are authentically concerned with creating meaningful educational alternatives; the seeming openness of many educators is merely a facade for a deeper sense of dependance. Such teachers and administrators are victims of a system of schooling which has always dictated alternatives and provided rewards and punishments on the basis of obedience. In the reality of the present, authority becomes manifest in newer forces of apparent innovation and educators who are so predisposed look to the innovator to be told what to do. Another ready type of consumer of

education innovation include those persons disposed to what is fashionable. Such education fadism was seldom in evidence among conference participants, although there was a more noticeable sampling of teachers is search of new sources of authority.

The implication of this for NEPTE is that in addition to providing and encouraging new models of policy and practice in education, there is a need to encourage clear understanding and development of the underlying values and objectives of learning. To ignore this all important need is to run the risk of replacing one form of domination with another that may be less recognizable in its guise of modernity.

Third, the terms "open classroom" and "humanistic education" as mentioned earlier were frequently used by conference participants and many resource leaders. It was the observation of the evaluation team that these terms were used as "slogans" that often lacked clarity. This is not to suggest that these notions are unimportant, but rather there is a need to help educators clarify the values of humanism implied in humanistic education and the features of system and methods referred to as "open". It was interesting to note that in individual interviews with participants at several of the conferences, they had great difficulty in explaining the meaning of these terms. The most common interpretation was reactive; open classrooms and humanistic education was most commonly described as the absence of "traditional" policies and practices. The implication of this is related to the need identified earlier for value clarification. What is needed is a richer, clearer, and more positive understanding of these concepts among teachers and administrators.

Fourth, perhaps the single most important need expressed by participants was the need to develop skills and knowledge to effectively plan

and implement educational change. In many of the presentations and workshops within all the conferences, the question continuously arose as to how administrators and the community came to accept and support the changes that were being described and demonstrated by various resource leaders.

A need exists which is not being met by State Boards of Education in teacher training institutions to provide inservice training for teachers in the area of planning and implementing educational change. The implication for NEPTE is that there is a unique opportunity to serve the educational community of New England by providing, encouraging and supporting programs and services that would increase the knowledge and skills of teachers and administrators who want to plan for and implement new educational policies, strategies, and practices.

Fifth, an analysis of the participants of all the conferences indicates that there were two very important groups that were not represented in significant numbers: students and school committees. These two groups are of particular significance because school committees represent the most basic level of power in education and students are, of course, the persons who are most affected by educational policies and practices. The implications of these facts for NEPTE are several:

1. If teachers are to explore and consider educational alternatives, then they would benefit from a wider reality base and student and school committee members would provide such a base.

2. If educational alternatives are to be encouraged, it is helpful to develop as broad a base of support and understanding as possible, and it would be particularly helpful to teachers and administrators to have school committee members and students become learning partners with them.

In light of the major concerns of the participants with the issues of freedom, change, role change, and community, it seems particularly relevant to involve a greater number of school committee persons and students in future conferences and programs for teachers and administrators.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are more thematic than programmatic. The reason for this is that the evaluation team feels that programmatic elements of the conferences such as design, planning, preparation, and logistics were undertaken with skill and effectiveness. It is our assumption that those who will read this report either are aware of or will easily identify some minor shortcomings in the conference programs. Since it is the opinion of the evaluators that such shortcomings are few and minor, the recommendations offered are based upon wider issues concerning the needs of participants and the role of NEPTE.

1. The only programmatic recommendation that will be offered is that conferences such as those which were held be for a longer duration. The level of commitment and interest of participants would justify a longer conference or a series of one-day workshops. The attitudes of participants suggest that there is both a need and interest in more extensive programs such as were offered through these conferences. It is the opinion of the evaluators that the positive reception of the conferences has established a base for attracting people to NEPTE-sponsored conferences in the future.

2. It is recommended that more students be involved in future programs both as participants and as resource persons. Students who did attend and participate in the conferences (elementary as well as secondary and college students) were very well received. It is also suggested that students participate in the planning of the conference.

3. It is recommended that more representatives from school committees be involved in future programs both in the planning stage and as participants.

Further, if it has not been previously considered, and if NEPTE feels it is appropriate, that NEPTE consider ways of working more closely with and influencing school committees in New England.

4. It is recommended that there be an increased program emphasis in dealing with the issues of planning for and implementing change. Such a program could consist of a series of workshops, an institute, or available technical assistance and consultation to school systems throughout New England. The purpose of such a program effort would be to help educators develop skills and understandings in the strategies and methods of bringing about educational change.

5. It is recommended that there be a mechanism for followup of conferences to encourage regional planning, collaboration, and development. This could be achieved by having regional persons serve on a planning team and in the process of planning to design for followup and possible ongoing learning activities in their geographic area.

6. It is recommended that there be a greater degree of dissemination of information about innovative educational strategies, policies, and methods to those who have participated in NEPTE conferences and others who are interested. This would provide both follow-up of conferences, as well as an effective contact and communications network for the New England area.